This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

204
M468

204
M468

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

STANFORD
LIBRARIES

WAR AND RELIGION

A SOCIOLOGICAL STUDY

BY
RABBI ELI MAYER

PHILADELPHIA, PA., 1918

STANFORD LIBRARY

A THESIS

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL IN
PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

COPYRIGHT, 1918
RABBI ELI MAYER

253081

STANFORD LIBRARY

DEDICATED

TO

MY INSPIRATION, MY LOVE, MY WIFE

JESSIE STRAUS

Table of Contents

'reface 7

ntroduction 9

'hapter I, "War and Religion in Theory" 13

'hapter II, "War and Religion in Fact" 20

Section A—War Among Remote Ancestors: "Men of the Old Stone Age" and of "the Bronze and Iron Age."

Section B—Religion Among Remote Ancestors.

Part 1—"Men of the Old Stone Age" and of the "Bronze Age."

Part 2—"Contemporaneous Ancestors."

A—Introductory Remarks; B—Tasmanians; C—Australian Aborigines; D—American Indian; E—Torres Straits; F—Melanesians; G—African Aborigines; H—Todas; I—Aboriginal Siberia; J—South American Aborigines; K—Summary.

'hapter III, "War and Religion in Fact." Period of Immediate Ancestors, 32

Section A—Bird's-eye View of War in the First Part of the Period.

Section B—War and Religion Among the Most Ancient of Our Immediate Ancestors.

Part 1—The Egyptians.

Part 2—The Babylonians and Assyrians.

Part 3—Zoroastrians.

Part 4—Buddhists of India.

Part 5—Chinese.

Part 6—Japanese.

Part 7—Greeks.

Part 8—Romans.

Part 9—Semites.

Section C—War and Religion Among Christian and Mohammedan Peoples.

'hapter IV, "War and Religion Among Contemporaries" 60

Introduction.

Part A—Christ. B—Old Testament vs. New Testament. C—Germany Christian or un-Christian. D—Religious Claims in General. E—Quakers. F—Tolstoy. G—Bernhardi. H—Summary.

hapter V, "Conclusions from the History of War and Religion" ... 79

ibliography on "War and Religion" 88

eferences in the Text of "War and Religion" 90

Preface to War and Religion

THIS prefatory word is to serve a double purpose. It aims to furnish a general background for this work; and further, to explain the unusual amount and length of quotations.

The exposition of the background of this work involves the introduction of the personal element. The writer is an officiating minister. He was born and raised in the peaceful American atmosphere so wholly conducive to the idea that religion, above all else, must mean a reasoning relationship among men for the settlement of all difficulties. The isolation of the United States, the traditional American sentiment against entangling alliances, the genuine religious idealism pervading this land, conjured a picture of internationalism and universal arbitration that eliminated the lurid colors of warfare. The writer was not unmindful of the religious doctrine of the "God of Battles." He was generally aware of the war gods of the old national ploytheisms. But for the reasons given above, and for others of less importance, he felt that the prophetic vision of "nations not learning war any more" was most near of realization. Science had made religion adjust itself to this era of evolutionary thinking. Religion, thus newly oriented, could look for lofty ranges of spirituality from science. Religion and science seemed to have agreed that "God's in His Heaven—all's right with the world!" made winter's weary war-wastes but a passing phase to peaceful earth's eternal spring. But war stalked across the land. Where was God?

When able, earnest men of God changed their peace themes of yesterday to war themes of today, the impossible seemed to have transpired. Of course man cannot speak in absolutes; but the zeal of the ideal religionist is so proverbial, that one felt that the modern seer who said: "Thus saith the Lord of Peace" could not readily shift to "Thus saith the God of War." Conviction in religion is so intense that it would seem natural to posit as religion's best watchword: "One with God is a majority."

But when this reversal took place, it occurred to the writer to inquire whether this veering, so unlooked for, was an exception. Despite his vague impressions that religion had been caught in the net of war, he cherished the idea that it was an unwilling captive. He approached, therefore, this subject, with a certain hope, if not prejudice, that he would show a nobler record for religion than that made by her living supporters. But despite this bias, the evidence rolled in, in one steady stream, supporting full well the present-day attitude of all religionists in granting their blessings to each and every country's cause.

The question then arose as to the manner of handling the mass of evidence that was gathered. The easiest method would have been to give a summary of a few typical instances, and merely add the comment that these were characteristic of the relations of war and religion everywhere and always. But the subject is of such deep concern to the world at large, and the idea is so widespread that religion means peace and only peace, that it was feared such a method would prove unfair to all

concerned. It would provoke, justly, the criticism that the author put his own interpretation upon the facts instead of letting the facts speak for themselves. Obviously it is not the most exalted task to string together long series of quotations. But it was concluded to be the wisest and most convincing method for this first part of the study on war and religion, dealing exclusively with the data of history.

This evidence is so absolutely consistent that it seems safe to predict that theology will be revolutionized, at least in the United States, after the war. Not that the writer does not believe that the God concept must and will survive. As long as mystery baffles man, so long must man assume an attitude towards it. But the law which history apparently establishes as to the relations between war and religion, cannot but constitute either a challenge to religion to become the primary factor in life, or a confirmation of its historic role of supporting the hands of war. This latter alternative appears to be the path of least resistance; and if the law of inertia be applicable here, then religion will continue to be one of the chief aids of war, as in the past. If religion, however, takes the leading strings, it can decree war or peace.

The writer prefers to reserve further expression of opinion until the close of his studies on the psychological and biological aspects of the subject. In the meantime, he looks for sound and thorough criticism of his theses; but he trusts that all may find his effort filled with the spirit of fairness, honesty and reverence for all faith which he holds most dear.

ELI MAYER.

Introduction

This study of "War and Religion" is planned wholly along the lines of Sociology. This means that the following pages do not contain any plea, whatsoever, either against war and for religion, or for war and against religion. As a sociological study, it aims to presents first of all, authoritative data throwing light on the mutual relationship between war and religion; and after assembling the material in a manner approximating as closely as possible to scientific standards, to draw the plain, inevitable conclusions which the statements of history, human thinking and research must lead to. In brief, the canons of science and not the arts of rhetoric and appeal will be sedulously followed, however much the subject may lend itself to, or seem to demand, the hortative and the emotional.

The subject of the investigation naturally suggests both the lines of research and the result that will be obtained. While the biological and psychological are as fundamental to social science and theory as the historical, it became quickly apparent that a preliminary consideration of "War and Religion" must be narrowed more or less to the historical. And even in this field the ground to be covered seems so interminable, that one finds himself grateful for the concession of science, in its validation of evidence on the basis of a fair sample. For a study of war involves the vast ranges of all human history; and delving into recesses of religion means an effort almost parallel to the course of man as a fighter. This much then the title surely conveys that a resumé will be given of the record of man pugnacious and man religious.

May it be presumed that the name given to this essay makes equally clear the truths that are expected to be established? "War and Religion" by the very juxtaposition of the words themselves, gives more than a hint that there is an essential connection between these two terms. And this is the first conclusion that may be drawn from the evidence to be submitted. Further proof may be afforded readily to show, that the dependence of war on religion and vice versa is not only essential, but also thoroughgoing, thus furnishing ample warrant for binding these pages under the title selected. And finally, the chronicles of humanity seem to affirm, that in this relationship between war and religion, the latter is the secondary factor, war being the primary and for that reason it is placed first in the caption.

But this skeleton outline of the territory to be covered and the goal to be reached gives little hint of the delimitations of the subject matter and of the method of procedure. Here the first real difficulties are encountered partly, because the sciences of Sociology and the History of Religions are so comparatively new, and partly because diligent search has failed to reveal among the many titles that express or point to a treatment of war and religion, any that approach the theme, wholly or in part, from the scientific viewpoint alone. Two small books were found that may be regarded as corollaries of the main theorem:—"LES ENSEIGNES—Cultes Militaires De Rome," by Charles Renel (Lyon et

Paris 1903); and "Die Religion Des Römisches Heeres," by Alfred von Domaszewski (Trier 1895). But the greatest number of volumes are briefs taking sides; they are of the domain of theological apologetics or theories of war and its governance. One, therefore, has to grope after a method in handling the unwieldy material, and offer it as a tentative one for the working out of the problem. But the present undeveloped state of the sciences mostly involved is a great source for bewilderment, because nomenclature is so scanty and dubious; and, most troublesome of all, definitions are almost as cumbersome as they are varied and numerous. Perhaps it is best to get the less of the two obstacles out of the way first.

As the great body of literature that had to be gone through loomed continually larger, it became apparent that a complete survey of it all would necessitate useless and wearisome repetition. An effort was therefore made to confine the attention to the most important phases of religion and to the wars deemed most critical in history. The first care in selecting items from the bibliography was, of course, directed to the scientific value of the author and book. At the same time, however, an effort was made to use such authorities, more particularly, in the realm of religion, who combined the characteristics of the impartial searcher after truth with a warm, sympathetic interest in the religion under analysis.

The easiest method of arranging the material seemed to be the chronological. Justification for this supposition was amply afforded as the study progressed. Accordingly three major divisions were plotted. To describe them, one is beset with the anomalies that the nomenclature of a developing science presents. For the present, therefore, the three great periods will be called vaguely, first that of remote ancestors; the next that of immediate ancestors; and finally, that of contemporaries. In each of these epochs human behavior will be studied in its fairly typical reactions to war and religion.

This much may suffice for the way in which the facts will be marshalled, deferring detailed remarks till the unfoldment process itself is begun. But a somewhat longer delay must be submitted to in discussing definitions.

What has been stated to be the primary factor, war, may be defined very readily. The language of any up-to-date dictionary may be quoted first. The Standard Dictionary (New York 1910) goes to the following length: "War, ...A contest, as between nations or states, or between different parties in the same state, carried on by force and with arms, commonly either for defense, for avenging insults and redressing wrongs, for the extension of commerce and acquisition of territory, or to obtain and establish the superiority and dominion of one of the belligerents over the other; also the condition of things created by such a contest." Then follows an equally lengthy note amplifying the preceding statement. These ideas may show the limits of the war concept as interpreted by modernity, but warfare is an institution that antedates vastly both states and nations. More scientific therefore appear to be the terms in which Bertrand Russell equates war when he says[1]: "War is a conflict between two groups, each of which attempts to kill and maim as many as possible of the other group in order to achieve some object which it

desires. The object is generally either power or wealth." This definition fits in better with the bellicosity of man as he emerges into the dawn of primeval history many millennia ago; and on the basis of the claim and counterclaim of present-day belligerents, it measures in no less apt terms the meaning of war to this latest of the generations.

Assuming that the idea "war" is now clear, the much more difficult task is encountered in attempting to define "religion." M. Jastrow, Jr., in his "The Study of Religion" (London and New York 1902) devotes an entire chapter of forty-four pages to the topic of "The Character and Definitions of Religion." Further, R. R. Marett, in a more recent publication frankly confesses: "Definitions of words are always troublesome; and Religion is the most troublesome of all words to define[2]."

As it is hardly within the scope of this book to undertake a lengthy consideration of this very moot topic, it is necessary not to say desirable now to reach some sort of a definition of religion that will appear at least to embody, in however crude a manner, the essential idea or ideas common to the large majority of opinions expressed. Either a superficial or intensive look into the literature seems to reduce all thought and speculation on religion to a common denominator which may be expressed by the word "mystery." One is tempted here to roam into psychological by-ways especially with Leuba and possibly Marett, but again logical sequence forbids. To return then to this element of mystery posited as a, if not the, fundament in religion, most striking confirmation of the appeal of the mysterious, as the soul of religion, is found in a little volume published ostensibly to prove that "the scope of religion in society has been declining all along the ages from the primitive world to ours[3]." Yet the lasting impression which the booklet leaves is the thought of the never-dying power of this sense in man mainly because it is rooted in mystery. The author may speak for himself in the words[4]:—"The potency of the mysterious is the fundamental historical basis of religion." Continuing elsewhere, this sentiment is disclosed[5]:—"There are two things which make awe and reverence eternally possible. And they are the two which set us going along the whole path of this evolution, from primitive man to ourselves, life on the one hand, and matter on the other—and both are mysteries . . . . . .These are final mysteries, and there is no fulcrum in all the universe to move them from our path, however we strain on the lever." And he sums up his ideas in this conclusion[6]:—"Indeed since we now see the mystery in life itself which we used to find in death, as long as life endures the tremulous note of reverence will sound across the still clear spaces of the mind. But the tone from that eternal thrill will be moulded, under the control of reason, into other forms than that fantastic, barbaric and discordant theme which has held and still so largely holds the drama of our ancient myths—and our theologies."

This same note is struck, though perhaps not with the same emphasis, by Leuba in his "Psychological Origin of Religion." For present purposes it may be sufficient to quote this sentence or two[7]. "The necessity of a Maker is, no doubt, borne in upon the savage at a very early time, not upon every member of the tribe, but upon some peculiarly gifted individual who imparts to his fellows the awe-striking idea of a mysteri-

ous, all-powerful Creator. The form under which the Creator is imagined is, of course, derived from the beings with which his senses have made the savage familiar." In somewhat similar vein runs the thought of Toy who writes[8]:—"..... in the vegetable world and in the life of man in which nature's productivity is easily recognizable, life has been perpetually unfolding itself under men's eyes as a mysterious process, which by virtue of its mysteriousness, has become religious material and has entered into systems of worship." Finally there should be quoted Marett's telling words[9]:—"I define the object of religion to be whatever is perceived as a mystery and treated accordingly." On the basis, therefore, of these and many similar expressions the following definition of religion is ventured more especially for the purposes of this dissertation. Religion is an attitude to mystery. This appears to be inclusive enough to provide for pre-human manifestations of brain development and also to embrace the speculations of the most modern thinkers as quoted above.

From these introductory considerations concerning the title and its implications, the content and conclusions involved, the definitions of war and religion, the way is cleared for a review of some basic theories on man as a battler and man as struck by the mystery inherent in things.

STANFORD LIBRARY

I. War and Religion in Theory

It was stated in the introductory observations that this study was to be regarded as a preliminary one, making wholly preponderant the historical element. While the all-important biological and psychological foundations cannot and will not be slighted, it was felt that it was wisest to deal with such highly developed social human institutions as are war and religion from the standpoint of the abundant evidence which history in its broadest lines affords. When the tale of this age-old witness had been impartially told, an accurate conclusion could be arrived at; and then seemed to be the proper time to marshal the discoveries and theories of those special sciences that scrutinize the mechanism of the organisms and more especially their mentations. In a word, it seemed that history at its best must needs have a minimum of theory whereas the disciplines so closely related to Sociology that deal with the life processes would appear to have a maximum of hypothesis. Of course like most distinctions, the differences are more apparent than real; for ultimates are eternally facing one and the only anchorages are suppositions. Nevertheless a conscious and continuous effort has been made to steer clear of speculation by remaining on the broad expanse, on the plainly evident ocean of centuries of vouched-for occurrences in the long story of human evolution. To get under way then, this modicum of attention to theories concerning war and religion must preface the record.

This prefatory theoretical section will be extremely limited and narrow both in order to hew close to the purpose of these pages and to preserve as much as possible unity of thought. Hence there will be given no heed to a scientific Euhemerus in his efforts to rationalize religion nor to such as are of the ilk of the Church Fathers who theologize divinity into statute and ordinance. Nor again can the ancient classic thinkers find a place here with their theories of war and society; and the same scant courtesy must be shown to a Hobbes and Malthus as to a Gumplowicz. Mainly to fit into the spirit of what follows, this short excursus into the hypothetical will deal almost entirely with but a few of the most modern thinkers, if not of contemporaries.

Just as the greater part of all thinking on the problem of religion, of speculation past as well as present, sifts down to the idea of the attitude to mystery, so the residuum of the greatest part of human thought regarding the origin of all human institutions and endeavor points to society, to the social complex, as the womb whence thoroughly evolved man derived his being. In a word, these theories have it that apart from society man would have been and is unthinkable.

To cite testimony there may be quoted the fairly recent opinion of Marett. "Psychology" says he[1] "must preside over the investigations of Comparative Religion. It remains to make explicit what anthropologists of the British school have hitherto recognized but vaguely, that a Social, not an Individual, Psychology can alone be invested with this function." And again, he posits firmly[2]:—"I hold that religion in its psychological aspect is, fundamentally a mode of social behavior."

Practically in similar vein runs the thought of Russell when he states[3]:— "Devotion to the nation is perhaps the deepest and most widespread religion of the present age. Like the ancient religions, it demands its persecutions, its holocausts, its lurid and heroic cruelties; like them it is noble, primitive, brutal and mad."

This school of sociological thought finds, perhaps, its best exponent in Durkheim, especially as reflected in his "The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life." This work, from cover to cover, misses no opportunity to insist that "religion is something eminently social[4]." Durkheim sees the power of society in making the furniture of the mind, as for example the categories of time and space. While recognizing the individual element in man, it is the social which represents the highest. "In so far as he belongs to society, the individual transcends himself, both when he thinks and when he acts[5]." In his lengthy definition of religion, it is the "eminently collective" element that he emphasizes[6].

He argues at great length[7] to show that "totemism is tightly bound up with the most primitive social system which we know, and in all probability of which we can conceive." It is hardly pertinent to digress here for a discussion of the claim to priority of totemism, or animism, magic, teratism, shamanism or any other form of belief that has been posited by scientists as first in religious evolution. Further, the discussion of a definition of religion in the preceding chapter obviates the necessity of pausing for Durkheim's definition of totemism, unless it be to note in passing that he seems to dwell here more upon the mysterious than upon the social factors[8]. It is valuable to mention that as he strives to make wholly clear the totemic principle, he touches briefly on a matter that is close to the heart of this general survey of the relations of war and religion. The totem, as the source of the moral life of the clan, binds the members thereof together with definite duties of assistance, vendetta, etc.[9] Connecting the totemic principle with aboriginal ideas of wakan, orenda, and mana, he concludes that "the idea of force is of religious origin[10]."

The socializing or integrating power of totemism centers in its symbolism[11]. He develops this idea of the symbol at great length using the analogy of the flags of modern nations to make his thought vivid[12]. He logically turns then to a sort of "crowd psychology" interpretation of social evolution[13]. He clearly states that "it is in the midst of these effervescent social environments and out of this effervescence itself that the religious idea seems to be born." The cause of all these incitements to the emotions is the omnipresent totem image, "just as the flag or national emblem meets the citizen of a state in all places and events[15]."

Durkheim now reaches the core of his interpretation of totemism[16]. After dealing with the phenomena of tatooing, he traces the cause of these emblematic images. He finds that animals were naturally brought most in contact with nations of hunters and fishers, because "the animal constituted an essential element of the economic environment[17]." He then turns to his original thesis in his summary when he repeats that "This conception of totemism.....shows how logical evolution is closely connected with religious evolution and how it, like this latter, depends upon social conditions[18]."

In this interpretation then of the elementary forms of the religious life, all emphasis is placed upon society, upon that integrative potentiality inherent in humanity which renders group life the sine qua non of human existence and survival. All human institutions find their origin and maintenance in the gregarious instinct; and whatever has been and is must stand the test of sociality. The lengthy work found room, only in a footnote, for the importance of the individual; and even this brief reference seems to have been written[19] in the spirit of showing how completely subservient is the unit to the whole. This thin piping note is really lost in the heavy swell by which the main theme is exploited; for practically, the closing words but duplicate the opening ones, when near the very end of the volume, he says: "If religion has given birth to all that is essential in society, it is because the idea of society is the soul of religion[20]."

Durkheim gave practically no attention to war, in this volume. But if his dictum: "If religion has given birth to all that is essential in society" be taken on its face value, his theory logically necessitates the corollary that war is one of these by-products of religion. For whatever has been and is in society must be essential to society. This is Durkheim's own reasoning. He finds religion all pervasive in society, therefore, it is essential to society. But is it any the less true that warfare has been and is as surely a characteristic of society, and accordingly must have been somewhat vital to the development and continuation of society? Granting this, war must be attributed to religion. For if religion has given birth to all that is essential in society, and war is such an essential, then war must be laid at its door. This reverses the stand established by this study which aims to show that religion is secondary to war rather than that war is subsidiary to religion. But Durkheim's logic seems to maintain the first contention of this work that there is a connection between war and religion and that this connection is an essential one. And as for the position of religion itself, he makes it secondary and altogether subordinate to the social instinct in man. The question then that Durkheim leaves concerns the relations of war and society. Does war necessarily work for the ends of society, or does society inevitably mean war. This larger field has been industriously ploughed, and results will be noted later. For the present moment attention will be restricted to the thoughts of other authorities on the relations of the social and the religious.

Leuba does not go to the extremes of Durkheim in paying tribute to the power of society, but he unhesitatingly asserts that traditional religion was a "pedagogical device in the interest of social and individual morality[21]." He finds that the rejection of the two fundamental dogmas of Christianity, i. e., God and immortality, is apparently "destined to extend parallel with the diffusion of knowledge and the moral qualities that make for eminence in the scholarly pursuits[22]." His conclusion is that moral ideals and moral energy have their source in social life[23]. It is most interesting here to find his wholesale discount of religion in all that makes for heroism and self-sacrifice[24]. Most apropos of this subject of war and religion, is a remark, seemingly incidental, which Leuba injects into the closing part of his work. He says: "In the monstrous war we are now witnessing, is there a less heroic defense of home and

nation, and less conscious self-renunciation for the sake of others among the non-believers than among the professed Christians[25]?"

Jevons likewise endorses this social interpretation but with a stronger accent on the religious factor. He finds that the lack of uniformity in nature is the element provocative of the earliest glimmer of the light of religion. Success in working the mechanism of nature man took to himself; "but when the machinery did not work, he ascribed the fault to some overruling, supernatural power. In fine, when the natural ended the supernatural began[26]." "He must, therefore, from the beginning have been brought to confront a mysterious power which was beyond both his calculation and his control[27]." Jevons credits the origin of Social Obligation to the taboo institution[28]. It is not necessary to include here his theory of the rise of totemism through the blood feud and supernaturalism[29]. A summary is afforded by his own words: "...from the beginning, religion was not an affair which concerned the individual only, but one which demanded the co-operation of the whole community; and a religious community was the earliest form of society[30]."

It is difficult, however, to place one's finger on Jevons. At one point[31] he speaks of the development of religion in terms akin to Spencerian organic evolution. But anon, one reads, inter alia, "..as the laws of nature were in existence and in operation long before they were formulated by man, so before the truth was formulated that God is Love, His love was toward all His creatures.....so his heart responded with love to the divine love.....Man, being by nature religious, began by a religious explanation of nature[32]."

These last words quoted gainsay the impression given at the beginning of the book that it was the unusual, the catastrophic, the diseases, the blood feuds with man and beast, the wars, that roused man to the state of being aware of that mysterious power which was beyond both his calculation and control. If this is so, then it is not unfair to bring Jevons to support the assertion that there is an essential connection between war and religion. Whether Jevons would regard this connection as thoroughgoing is open to question. That war, however, is the primary factor, the argument of Jevons would abundantly establish. For, according to him, it is the cataclysm which crashes the truths of religion into man's mind, and war is certainly of the nature of the cataclysmic.

One remains somewhat uncertain as to Keane's ideas on religion, though he seems to affirm the dominating force of society[33]. These theories, however, on the place of religion in society, are best closed by adverting briefly to Spencer, more especially as his words dovetail most neatly into the second part of this chapter dealing with theories of war.

The Spencerian "Ghost Theory" has it that ancestor-worship is at the root of every religion[34]. His analysis of social grouping on the militant and the industrial basis[35] brings him to present, in a nutshell, the historical reaches of this study. Militant societies have religions of a militant character and of enmity[36]. The ecclesiastical organization follows the lines of the political. "Generally where the militant type is highly developed, the political head and the ecclesiastical head are identical—the king, chief descendant of his ancestor who has become a god, is also chief propitiator of him[37]."

Spencer here gives a real bird's-eye view of the projected contents of this volume. Along with a similarly sketchy reference in a most recent book by Brandes to be referred to later, here is stated by Spencer the nearest approximation of the goal to be reached by this study. Spencer places war as the primary factor. Religion is placed in an essential and secondary relationship to war; but the connections are not thoroughgoing. Industrialism will bring peace.

In passing now from these theories concerning religion to those dealing with war, Spencer may be referred to first not only because it conduces to consecutiveness, but principally for the reason that there is hardly an account to be found anywhere that gives in clearer and more convincing fashion the all-potent role that warfare has played in the onward movement of the social complex.

Spencer finds that "as at first, so afterwards, the wars of societies with one another have all-important effects in developing social structures or rather certain of them[38]." It is pressure, and difficulty in evading that pressure, that make for social integration[39]. It is warfare between societies that originates governmental structures and increases their efficiency[40]. ". . . . so the governmental-military organization of a society is initiated by, and evolves along with, the warfare between societies[41]." He traces the influences of war on the horde, and the uncivilized. "In the semi-civilized societies the conquering commander and the despotic king are the same; and they remain the same in civilized societies down to late times[42]."

Pitt-Rivers seems to glory in conditioning the evolution of culture in the past, present and future, on war. The struggle for mastery is most literally construed by him. He places it beyond the possibility of a doubt that "from the remotest age in which we find evidence of organized beings, war has been ordained to an important function in the creative process[43]." He pities Utopian peace dreamers for "we find no more evidence in nature of a state of society in which wars shall cease, than we do of a state of existence in which we shall support life without food, or propagate our species by other means than those which nature has appointed[44]." One is prepared then for his striking rhetorical question: "Who can doubt. . . . . that an instinct so widely disseminated and so identical in men and animals, must have been ordained for special objects[45]?"

The champions, however, of the idea that war has played such a decisive part in man's past are legion; and they are so redoubtable that only a few more scattering references will be included before closing this section.

Strange as it may appear, Jevons must be included in this group[46]; for despite his idyllic picture of divine and human love, his pages contain more than one statement to the effect that "In the view of early man, war is a holy function; before going into battle, the sacrifice is offered to the clan-god, the warriors are consecrated to him, and are placed under the taboos ordinarily imposed on those who are in direct and special communion with the clan-god[47]."

Thomas throws a most illuminating side-light on this whole discussion with his remarks on race prejudice. He closes his analysis of this fixed

and instinctive trait of the mind by saying that "This is not a laudable attitude, but it has been valuable to the group, because a bitter and contemptuous feeling is an aid to good fighting. No race or nation has yet freed itself from this tendency to exalt and idealize itself[48]."

A slightly more idealistic picture of man, the fighter, is given by Kellogg in his short but intensely interesting work: "Beyond War." The book is all the more valuable because it appeared a scant two years before this war broke out. He finds that man's beginnings, both phyletic and ontogenic, are dominated by instinct, until slowly and painfully, reason and control are in the ascendant, and "the grown race looks back with horror to the brutish life of its glacial life beginnings.[49]" While there are remnants of these fighting instincts still inhering in man of today, the dominating reason and soul of man is deliberately eliminating them[50]. As evolution made man a fighter, it will also make him a peaceful creature substituting reason and altruism for instinct and egoism[51].

But Russell cannot find such roseate promise in the progressive use of reason[52]. The nub of the matter for him is the turning of the impulses and passions into channels opposite to those that lead to war. "Blind impulse is the source of war, but it is also the source of science, and art, and love[53]." So it is not the weakening of the life of impulse but the directing of it that is the important thing. The crux of the matter for him is "That the ultimate fact from which war results is the fact that a large proportion of mankind have an impulse to conflict rather than harmony, and can only be brought to co-operate in resisting or attacking a common enemy[54]." Basing himself on this belief, he encompasses the whole range of human history in the few words: "In spite of the fact that most nations at most times are at peace, war is one of the most permanent institutions of all free communities[55]."

At this point, the review of theories concerning war will rest. It may have seemed strange that so far no word has been written of Darwinian theory. It was decided to postpone touching upon it until the closing chapter. Thus in a most rapid and perhaps somewhat arbitrary fashion there have been sketched some theories concerning war and religion. The sum total of the authorities consulted yields more than a tithe of evidence to support the original propositions of this study. Religion has been found to be secondary whether society or war be placed first. Many regard the role of religion as one devoted to the ends of society or war. The large school of thinkers, who look upon society or sociality as the rock-bottom factor in the evolving of the human type, was represented by Durkheim, because his work is a most recent study, and he forges his chain of reasoning with material which he regards as the earliest religion of man, i. e., the system of totemism. On the basis of his statement: "If religion has given birth to all that is essential in society, it is because society is the soul of religion;" there was found ample ground to sustain the claim that religion is essentially connected with war. Similar support was yielded by Jevons, in his interpretation of the influence of the supernatural. With a word or two from several other scholars, the argument from religious theories was closed with Spencer's plain expressions of the subserviency of religion to the social process; and his equally unvarnished inductions on the functional importance of war opened the second part

of this chapter. A fitting complement was found in the assumptions of Pitt-Rivers, who, in his "Evolution of Culture," which was issued in 1906 with an introduction by Henry Balfour, gives a most frank confession of faith in a Providence that has created organic life in such a way that it must lead a warring existence. Several books were then referred to that were published within the last three or four years, one of which read that the same evolution which planted the pugnacious instinct in man would also root it out. Finally, Russell's theory that the primary impulse to war should be turned into channels, equally rousing and passionate, but constructive instead of destructive, closed this glance into the vast reaches of theory that men have evolved from many centuries ago to the present day. The "prehistory" which was made so distinct in the sweeping view of Russell and Kellogg serves the course of this study well as it turns now from theory to fact. The discussion of "War and Religion in Fact" will begin with a search of the meager records of the so-called men of the Stone Age, who were the remote ancestors of the men of today.

II. War and Religion in Fact

Section A—War Among Remote Ancestors

As the knowledge of the remote ancestors of mankind grows slowly, but surely, in volume, the conviction becomes proportionately stronger that the terminology used to describe them is unscientific and unfair. Of course names often become so conventionalized that their implications are no longer considered as judgments passed on their bearers; or they become so fossilized that they survive through sheer inertia. As the Fiji Islanders or tribes of Africa are thought of as pagans, or cannibals, or savages, so men of the great Glacial Age are called prehistoric with all the pride that a self-conscious civilization can put into the term. This pride may be justified by the argument of Thomas quoted above, as of survival value. But when placed in proper perspective, the whole scene is rearranged. An enthusiast over the achievements of those most ancient men will not be slow to turn the tables the other way. Even such appellations as "men of the Stone Age" and especially "the primitive peoples" have a ring to them, qualitatively, that should make for their disuse, in the light of scientific fact. The view which Thomas gives[1] of the mental life and education of those men, so inconceivably removed from us in time, ought to go far toward the reconstruction of language-technique, if only for the sake of ordinary justice. A single quotation from the "Source Book for Social Origins" may make this point most clear. "Modern inventions" says Thomas "are magnificent and seem quite to overshadow the simpler devices of primitive times; but when we consider the precedents, copies, resources, and accumulated knowledge with which the modern investigator works, and on the other hand the resourcefulness of the primitive man in materials, ideas, and in the inventive habit itself, I confess that the bow and arrow seems to me the most wonderful invention in the world[2]." Further, it means but a most cursory reading of O. T. Mason's account of "Woman's Share in Primitive Culture" to complete this new attitude assumed to the people of long ago.

In the light of all this, it would be manifestly unfair not to say unscientific to think of those folk of that far-off yesterday in any other way than as the forbears of the present inhabitants of the earth. Hence these pages will refer to them as Remote Ancestors. The name may be awkward, but it is habit after all that rounds the edges of things. This train of thought was started several years ago upon reading Thomas' "Source Book for Social Origins." In it, he refers[3] to tribal society as being a "virtually delayed civilization, and the savages are a sort of contemporaneous ancestry." This last phrase "contemporaneous ancestry" was so illuminating, suggestive, and above all so utterly frank and fair, that it persisted in thought, and led to the idea of dividing this study into the three major parts of Remote Ancestors, Immediate Ancestors, and Contemporaries. In whatever spirit this may be taken, it is safe to say that some revision of concepts is necessary when thinking of the groups that flourished millennia ago. What implications this may have for theories of civilization and progress, may be touched upon subsequently.

It may be well now to be more definite as to the time limits of the periods to be treated. The first, that of Remote Ancestors, will include those countless ages stretching from the dawn that first saw man as man on this earth, to the budding of what is usually referred to as the period of the early civilizations, such as Egypt, Babylon, Assyria. But in this study these early civilizations will mark but the beginning of the second large division called that of Immediate Ancestors. This latter period extends to the present generation, referred to as the period of Contemporary Peoples.

The first, vast period, that of Remote Ancestors, will consist of two large sections. The so-called "Men of the Old Stone Age" will be considered first. While not satisfactory, one must use perforce the usual terms employed in speaking of men of this era as Eolithic, Palæolithic and Neolithic. The second section will deal with the "Contemporaneous Ancestors" or the so-called ethnic groups, such as the aborigines of Tasmania, Australia, Siberia, North and South America, India and Africa.

The second large division will have three main sections. The first will review war and religion among the Egyptians, Babylonians, Assyrians, Zoroastrians, Buddhists of India, Chinese and Japanese. The second section will embrace the Greeks, Romans and Semites. The third will set forth the attitude of Christianity and Mohammedanism.

The following chapter will give a survey of contemporary thought on war and religion. Attention will naturally be concentrated on the immediate present. A closing chapter will summarize conclusions and will contain a word on a theory of progress.

Though these many groups will be investigated only as regards their reactions to war and religion, the material at hand is so very bulky that every effort will be made to keep strictly within due proportions the fair samples of each that will be presented. The authorities to be most drawn upon for the first part dealing with Remote Ancestors are H. F. Osborn, in his "Men of the Old Stone Age" and T. E. Peet in his "The Stone and Bronze Ages in Italy and Sicily."

Osborn considers, at some length, problems that belong more to the biological and psychological fields, in presenting the dawn age of man. As these factors are to be treated in a separate work, this study can now present but the fact that the erect attitude enabled upright simians to emerge from their ancestral forests in societies, armed with sticks and stones "and with the rudiments of all the powers that eventually enabled them to conquer the world[4]." The psychological analysis of these semi-human creatures leaves no doubt that they were essentially fighters, with no suggestion of rudimentary religion in their make-up[5].

Europe was not the only scene of these struggling groups. The first periods of human life, called Pre-Chellean and Chellean have left their traces all over the world. They are not due to the transmission of culture from one center, but arose spontaneously everywhere because of the ubiquity of the needs of war, the chase and domestic life[6]. Life was passed mainly in open camps with the rare exceptions, when caverns were sought for protection from enemies and as rain shelters rather than as retreats from a bitter, cold climate[7]. The workers of the Acheulian flints who were probably for the most part members of the Neanderthal race pene-

trated all parts of western Europe except the Scandinavian and Alpine ice-fields[8]. "It is only in late Acheulian times that human burial rites or interments begin and that skeletal remains are found[9]." But as this part is to deal with war among these Remote Ancestors, further reference to these first evidences of religion must be deferred until the part concerned with religion is reached[10]. Osborn states that "In many characteristics the Neanderthal skull is shown to be nearer to that of the anthropoid apes than to that of Homo Sapiens[11]."

It is especially valuable to include here the reasoning of Broca in explaining the superior mean capacity of the skull of early man. He said that the average capacity of the skull in civilized nations must be lowered by the preservation of a considerable number of individuals, weak in mind and body, who would have been promptly eliminated in the savage state, whereas in the savage state the average includes only the more capable individuals who have been able to survive under extremely hard conditions of life[12].

But this turn to the speculative must be curbed[13] to note the rigorous climatic conditions[14] that enforced closer association among the Neanderthals with the resulting impetus to social integration[15]. This chance for development, however, did not last long, speaking in terms of geologic time, for "between twenty and twenty-five thousand years before our era. . . . .no trace of the survival of the pure Neanderthal type has been found in any of the Upper Palæolithic burial sites." It is presumed that this sudden disappearance of the Neanderthals was due in part to degeneration, in part to the very severe conditions of life of the fourth glaciation, but to no small extent to the entrance into Europe of the superior Cro-Magnon race who dispossessed the Neanderthals of their principal stations and drove them out of the country or killed them in battle. It would seem that this new race possessed the bow and arrow. This alone constituted a tremendous advantage over the Neanderthals who had only wooden weapons and the stone headed dart and spear[16]. These Cro-Magnons belong to Homo Sapiens. Men of the modern type, therefore, entered Europe somewhat over twenty-five thousand years ago. The culture they brought to Europe bespeaks connections with the East, "making it probable that their evolution had taken place somewhere on the continent of Asia[17]."

The fact that no evidence has thus far been found that even the Neanderthal women were spared or allowed to remain in the country is grim proof of the methods of warfare of the Cro-Magnons. This new race, however, was a comparatively highly cultured one, excelling especially in the æsthetic sense[18]. It is noted that "the brain capacity of the Cro-Magnon woman surpasses that of the average male of today[19]." In art, this race reached such a high point of excellence that Osborn refers to them as "the Palæolithic Greeks[20]." The highest point of development they reached is known as the period of the Magdalenian Culture which began about 16,000 B. C.[21] It is inferred that these people had a form of tribal organization. Certain implements of reindeer horn, known as "batons de commandement," which will be touched upon later, constituting one of the common finds from this age, are supposed to have been insignia of authority borne by the chieftains[22]. An enumeration of the weapons used by

this race includes the description of javelin points artistically decorated, but also having deep grooves "perhaps intended for the insertion of poisonous fluids or the outlet of blood[23]."

Osborn thinks that "the decline of the Cro-Magnons as a powerful race may have been due partly to environmental causes and the abandonment of their vigorous, nomadic life;" or it may be they "had reached the end of a long cycle of psychic development which we have traced from the beginning of Aurignacian times. We know as a parallel that in the history of many civilized races a period of great artistic and industrial development may be followed by a period of stagnation and decline without any apparent environmental causes[24]."

The last phases of the Old Stone Age are believed to have extended from about 10,000 to about 7,000 B. C. It is said that the entrance to the final cultures is marked by a transition even more abrupt than the preceding changes. As Osborn saw mostly warfare at the remote beginning, so he lays greatest emphasis on this omnipresent element, in evolution, in his general summary. "No doubt each invasion, each conquest, each substitution of an industry or a culture had within it the impelling contest of the spirit and will of man, the intelligence directing various industrial and warlike implements, the superiority either of force or of mind[25]."

Pitt-Rivers, of course, fully avers that the art of war was dominant in the infancy of society[26]. Keane affords similar testimony[27]. Kellogg, while more extreme in his chronology, agrees entirely that Glacial Man was exclusively a hunter and killer. Fighting was carried on both intra- and inter-group. Coming down to the last stages of the Stone Age, he connects Neolithic Man with his bows and arrows, his strategy, cavalry, his fighting at greater distances, and in groups as armies, with the wars of Crete, Mycenæ and Egypt[28]. Thomson thinks that the keen and literal struggle, in the early days, round the platter of subsistence "wrought a natural selection to which we of today owe much." Later, when self-assertiveness supervened, the deadly inter-tribal wars favored not only strength but also solidarity, and thus made for the civilization and progress of the present[29]. Spencer assuredly finds that the co-operation most urgent at the outset "is that required for dealing with environing enemies and prey[30]."

This tale could be extended almost ad infinitum; for the facts which have been so painstakingly revealed from the caverns and kitchen-middens and excavations tell the same story of man pre-eminently the fighter. His struggle for existence is a most bloody one; and it is safe to say that the pugnacious instinct is as active as are the instincts of food and sex. Of religion, the accounts of earliest man are all silent. In the light of facts, therefore, war is the primary factor in human evolution, long existent before any manifestations of religion appear. When and how religion enters the pattern that evolution is weaving is to be dealt with now.

Section B—Religion. Part 1—Remote Ancestors

It seems generally agreed that it is impossible to state exactly how and when man started on his religious evolution. Of course in theory, genetics invariably proceed from pre-human stages. Religion may not be an exception to this rule; but as facts, in the strictest sense of the term, are now of uppermost interest, the argument will presume religion to be a human institution. The evidence so far yielded by exploration and research tends to show that when man assumed an attitude to the mystery of the death of certain individuals, his thought and action meant the beginning of religion. However Euhemeristic or Spencerian this may sound, the facts all point that way.

One must be clear first on man's earliest attitude to death. It would appear to be reasonable to say that death in general was as ordinary a phenomenon to remote man as were all events in nature. Opinion inclines to the view that the bodies of the dead and of the aged were thrown out to the hyenas or simply neglected by the way. Osborn is vacillating but lends weight to this view[31]. Brinton argues for simple exposure of the body, for beasts and birds to consume[32]. Kellogg agrees with this. He says that the earliest known human culture did not include the crudest elements of religion, at least as they are made discernible by any special care of the dead[33]. While Leuba thinks contrariwise, his words seem to apply more to ethnic societies of the present day, though he does say that any person belonging to the human species must have an aversion for casting to the dogs the body of a person liked and respected[34].

But the facts all seem to point to a time when man gave no heed to the dead; and on the face of it, it is most reasonable to suppose that there was such a time. However uncertain Osborn may appear to be, yet he is authority for the statement: "It is only in late Acheulian times that human burial rites or interments begin and that skeletal remains are found[35]."

What brought man to the practice of burial rites and ceremonial interments?

A rational explanation may be found in the following. The Durkheim school lays all emphasis on the power of sociality. It goes, if one may venture the opinion, to the mistaken length of reducing the individual's role to nil. But if earliest man was for the most part a fighter, his group or herd instinct was most valuable if it was guided by skilful leaders. Both reason and history testify to good leadership as a survival factor. Sociality is extremely valuable; but leadership is equally so. The mystery of the genius of leadership must have worked powerfully upon man; just as the mystery of the social bond must have reacted powerfully upon the leader. The unusual, the exceptional, the supernatural, as Jevons uses the term, was evinced when one being, apparently no different from the rest, came forward at the critical moment, and brought the group to do what it deemed to be the impossible. This interpretation may be dubbed atavistic, a resurrected hero-worship idea; but the facts of earliest man, and the entire range of human history, support it. It must have been the dead body of the powerful leader that still evoked those feelings of regard, inspired by him while alive, that made

the group first bestow some attention upon a corpse. Thus may have arisen ceremonial burial and with it the beginnings of religion.

This interpretation is not meant to be an exclusive one. There may have been other causes at work prior to and simultaneous with this system of interment, making for the development of religious thought and practice. But there is no tangible evidence of these. And as theory is being eschewed for the present, it is safe to assert that all facts point to the tombs of the chiefs as the first and greatest evidence that man was assuming an attitude to mystery, that is, he was beginning to think "religiously."

A. H. Quiggin finds that our only guides to the religion of Primeval Man are the few hints found in prehistoric graves[36]. ". . . . to the Neolithic Age belong some of the most impressive funeral monuments ever erected by man, ranking justly among the wonders of the world. The most characteristic and remarkable forms of burial (probably reserved for chiefs and important persons) were those in the long barrows and those associated with megaliths or stone monuments[37]." Here Leuba can adduce some helpful testimony[38]. In general, he says that one finds very early and in many tribes that "warriors and chiefs are assigned to a better and special heaven, etc.[39]" Jevons finds that "blood, babes and corpses" are three classes of objects that are inherently taboo[40]. Keane proves from neolithic architecture that it was in burial, in veneration (fear) of the dead that the first glimmerings of religious sentiment appear[41]. Brinton discusses this material at some length[42] and mentions specifically the theory that religion began when the living thought seriously of the dead, which he characterizes as a hasty assertion[43]. Nevertheless he finds also that the characteristic feature of the neolithic period is the funeral monument. "Then the full meaning of Death seems to have broken suddenly on man, and his whole life becomes little more than a meditatio mortis, a preparation for the world beyond the tomb[44]." Kellogg finds only Glacial and early post-Glacial Man to have possessed the beginnings of religion, "at least that basic feature of it betrayed by special attention to the dead body[45]." He refers specifically to Neolithic Man with his convention for the burial of the dead[46].

It is, of course, from Osborn and Peet that convincing evidence in abundance can be secured. Osborn gives a detailed account of the most recent discoveries in the Dordogne region[47]. The ceremonial burials discovered there and elsewhere, enabled him to conclude that "the Neanderthal race was imbued with reverence for the dead . . ." The Cro-Magnons followed the burial customs of the Neanderthals in many respects[48]. There were interred with the remains, implements of industry and warfare together with offerings of food[49]. His general conclusion is that "The religious sense, the appreciation of some power or powers behind the great phenomena of nature, is evidenced in the reverence for the dead, in burials apparently related to notions of a future existence of the dead, and especially in the mysteries of the art of the caverns[50]."

Peet finds even more true for the Bronze and Iron Ages what Osborn established for the Palæolithic[51]. He also speaks of the considerable funeral furniture and special methods of sepulture[52]. He shows that there was a very elaborate cult connected with the burial of the dead[53].

From resemblances noted with the finds made in other parts of Europe, he concludes that the neolithic inhabitants of Italy were of the same stock as those of other parts of Europe, North Africa and Asia Minor[54].

He calls the period succeeding the Neolithic, the Eneolithic, the distinguishing feature of which is the rock-hewn chamber-tomb[55]. This period is the link uniting our Immediate Ancestors with our Remote Ancestors; and it is best mirrored, so far, in the remains on the island of Sardinia with its inhabited caves, rock-tombs, "Giants' Graves," dolmens, menhirs and nuraghi[56]. Of these, the nuraghi seem to be the most interesting as they were the fortresses of the head of the tribe, "the centers perhaps of the tribal religion"[57]. Peet says that the advent of the first weapons of copper is the distinguishing feature of the period. The influence of Crete and the Spanish peninsula are apparent in Sardinia[58].

Turning to the Lake Dwellers and the Terramara folk, Peet discloses the type cultures of the late eneolithic and of the bronze[59]. Here again connection with the Ægean area is evident in cemeteries with elaborate tombs and rich funeral furniture[60]. Some interments show the transition stage from bronze to iron[61].

A summary of all this material must show how thoroughly it substantiates the ideas formulated in this study. When man looms on the hazy horizon which the light of scientific data is making clearer every day, he is found engaged in a deadly struggle for existence with a self-preservation program of "kill or be killed." Of the more than scanty remains of those millennially distant days, there is nothing to show that man had originally any religious ideas at all. As this instinctive program of self-preservation developed the horde and horde-leadership, there emerge into the realm of fact the first discovered bits of evidence that man was aware of some mystery inhering in things. His first attitude to this unknown and unknowable is shown presumably in the care with which he regarded the apparently useless dead body of his leader. Osborn's supposition that "batons de commandement" were insignia of authority borne by the chieftains[62] is helpful here, more especially when he testifies that "Geographically, the batons spread from the Pyrenees into Belgium and eastward into Moravia and Russia[64]."

At all events, the facts reveal man showing particular regard to some dead bodies; and the evidence for the office of chief, though slight, makes it not unreasonable to suppose that early man's respect, love, fear and reverence for his living chief roused the earliest religious thoughts over his dead body. For the chief had shown himself a conqueror of everything else except that mystery which stole the chief's breath, or made the life-blood run out of his body, or subjected him, the otherwise all-powerful, to the same ordinary process of decay and drivelling age that all other mortals had to pass through. The nature of the regard for the dead was shown in the funeral furniture, the most common objects of which were the weapons used in the life-struggle.

As life became more complex, it can hardly be doubted that social integration exalted to an ever higher plane the leaders who did so much to secure the survival of the group. A people that could reach the remarkable art level, so vividly described by Osborn and others, must have enjoyed an unusual degree of social complexity which was built on

a substratum of division of labor and specialization in functioning. While some scholars see in the marvellous cave-art, connections with religion, the weight of opinion seems justly placed on the contrary view. It does appear to imply too much of sophistication to read magical practices into these artistic endeavors of our Remote Ancestors. For this reason, this account lets the matter rest by quoting Osborn's reference to the men of the Magdalenian Culture as "the Palæolithic Greeks."

The distinctive religious fact of those earliest races of man was that of the burial rite, the ceremonial interment. This becomes clearer as Neolithic and Eneolithic Man unfold their story, the main features of which deal with their respect and regard for the dead. This closing period of the life of our Remote Ancestors was marked by the erection of the giant tombs that could have been intended only for the leaders, the chieftains, especially those head men who had led their hosts to victory.

This unfoldment, then, of the earliest evidence concerning man in his reactions to war and religion shows that war was primary, and existent long before religion entered upon the scene. As social grouping increases, the men who excel in fighting and in directing the battles of the group arouse such sentiments in their followers that they persist beyond the leader's life. The dead body is honored by careful burial. This ceremonial interment preserved, to this day, the first proof so far discovered, that man had started on his religious evolution. The memory of the dead chief was a source of power for his successor and for the group. The religious tradition may be said to have started, as far as the evidence goes, for the ends of war; and to have grown and have been perpetuated for the same reason. Hence religion was essential and secondary to war; and its connection with war was thoroughgoing throughout this first period, after it appeared in the ceremonial burials of Palæolithic Man, and was continuously evinced in the megalithic monuments that were the distinguishing feature of the closing days of our Remote Ancestors.

Instead of continuing the thread into the clear, historic weaving of our Immediate Ancestors, it was deemed best to pause here to consider those present-day helpless folk whose culture is supposed to parallel, to some extent, the life of our Remote Ancestors; and who have already been referred to, in the words of Thomas, as our Contemporary Ancestors.

Section B—Part 2—War and Religion Among Contemporaneous Ancestors

Tylor, in his "On the Limits of Savage Religion," gives a timely reminder that missionary influences have affected the beliefs of these humble folk for hundreds of years[64]. Granting this to be a fact is of no special concern to this study. For the present interest is to observe man's reactions to war and religion. It is immaterial what extraneous influences affected his position.

Tylor in his "On the Tasmanians as Representatives of Palæolithic Man," portrays a picture of these recently vanished folk that resembles in broad outlines the characteristics of our Remote Ancestors as sketched above[65]. H. L. Roth in "Aborigines of Tasmania" fills in many details[66]. Much of their religious thinking centered about death[67]. Of three forms of taboo, two related to death[68]. As for war, they were perpetually

engaged in savage battling among themselves[69]. Further references would but show that they had a minimum of religion and a maximum of war. (See further references, 70-75, in the Reference Section.) As they are, in part, of the stock of the Australian Aborigines, the outline of war and religion among these latter will atone for this curt treatment of the Tasmanians.

The connection between the Tasmanians and the Australian Aborigines is set forth in the up-to-date, scientific studies of Baldwin and Spencer.[76] They refer to the Tasmanians as of the Palæolithic type. While the Australian tribes are described as being quite pacific in their mutual relations[77] [78], there is abundant material to prove that this is relatively, rather than absolutely, true[79].

Sacred ceremonies play a very large part in the life of these people. They are all connected with the ancestors of the tribe[80]. "In every tribe there exists a firm belief in the reincarnation of ancestors[81]." Totemism is all prevalent; and it is very valuable to note here that most of the totemic groups believe that they arose as the direct offspring of one great eponymous ancestor[82]. This brings some support to the notion that religion had its rise, in part, at the tomb of the dead leader. The belief in the Wollunqua totem most vividly illustrates this supposition. (References 83, 84, 85 and 86.)

Of direct bearing on the matter of warfare among these tribes are the bloody rites of initiation[87]; the practice of infanticide[88]; and the fire ceremony[89] which was a form of personal arbitration of old quarrels. All ceremonies were handed down to them from the Alcheringa ancestors who were a kind of supermen[90]. They believed in good and evil spirits[91]. The Avenging Party is a common institution[92]. The medicine man aids the Party to find the guilty man[93] [94]. The authors say that year after year an endless kind of vendetta is maintained among these tribes, though fortunately, it sometimes happens that there is more noise than bloodshed[94]. Their weapons and implements are typical of both the Palæolithic and Neolithic Periods. (References 96 to 98.)

Particularly noteworthy are the Churinga which are specially marked sticks kept in a sacred storehouse called the Ertnatulunga. These are the most sacred possessions of the tribe. These sticks represent not only the living members of the tribe but also the dead ones, notably the special men of the Alcheringa, described roughly before as a kind of supermen ancestors. The Churinga of these dead are especially valuable for battle, giving to the possessor courage and accuracy of aim[99]. This may serve as a climax to the abundant testimony, afforded by these volumes, of the close connection between war and religion among these Australian Aborigines; and at the same time of the large part the important dead play in their warfare. (See further references 100 to 106.)

This testimony from the Australian Aborigines is fully confirmed by a study of the American Indian (see references 107 to 115); by a most superficial review of the "Reports of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to Torres Straits" (see references 116 to 122); in Codrington's account of the Melanesians. Codrington shows how the concept "Mana" is closely bound with success in warfare. The test of Mana in the ghost of a great departed warrior is the victory he helped his folk to obtain.

(See references 123 to 127.) The aboriginal folk of Africa also have beliefs and customs which show how vital is the bond that unites war and religion. (See references 128 to 145.) W. H. R. Rivers in his work on the Todas of India (see references 146 to 153) gives peculiarly interesting support to the weighty evidence already alluded to. The traits of war gods and of a warrior people survive among this isolated group in India with slightly greater functioning power than that which marks a vestigial organ. Rivers almost apologetically explains that "This disuse of weapons has indeed so obvious an explanation that it cannot be treated as an instance of degeneration." Does not this opinion betray the unconscious thought processes that associate war and its weapons with all that is virile, alive and possibly regenerative and progressive in humanity? Traversing Asia from tropic India to bleak Siberia there are discovered tribes whose blood feuds, blood-revenges, warfare and Shamanism parallel all the preceding record. Passing note should be made of groups referred to as Palæo-Siberians, who leave the corpse a short distance from the door of the hut to be eaten by dogs. (See references 153 to 163.) Turning to the Inca of South America, it is found that they claimed divine origin for themselves thus giving a religious character to the wars of conquest they carried on. Other South American Aborigines worshipped war gods by pouring out to them the blood of prisoners or offering the hearts of prisoners to them. Ancestor worship was generally practiced. Careful attention was given the disposal of the dead. There was an abundance of funeral furniture, not the least item of which was the weapon. (See references 164 to 170.)

The foregoing makes it amply clear that it is in the death of the head man that these Remote and Contemporaneous Ancestors find a great stimulus for thought on the mystery in things. It is the ghost or spirit of the departed, with its Churinga, its Mana, its power, that is appealed to in various ways mainly for the sake of success in warfare. Haddon summarizes it well in saying that the sacred principle of the African Aborigines and their ilk is: "Do unto your ancestors as you would they should do unto you." (Compare preceding reference 130.)

But whether the death of certain individuals did or did not initiate to a great extent man's religious evolution is at present beside the mark. This rapid glance at these groups commonly known as the men of the Stone Age, and as ethnic societies such as the Tasmanians, Australians, American Indians, Torres Straits inhabitants, African tribes, Todas of India, Siberian folk and South American Aborigines, reveals the close interrelations that have ever been maintained between war and religion. War, death and religion seem to constitute a trilogy of the drama of human unfoldment. The struggle for existence did not become the less bloody because man was developing a superior brain, and concomitantly evolving the mysterious sanctions of religion. On the contrary, an essential part of the ceremonious care of the dead was the dispostion of weapons beside the corpse.

The question may be raised as to the legitimacy of referring to these isolated ceremonial burials of the Stone Age, if not to the bloody rites and practices of the ethnic folk, as being of a religious nature. But it may be justified on the basis of the definition of religion used in this study, as

simply an attitude to mystery. This can include the recognition of a faith with a god or gods or without them. The mysterious power or powers in and about man may be vaguely referred to as Churinga, Mana, Manitou, spirits or ghosts. It may be evidenced in the special forms of interment alone. It may call for sacrifices of the bloodiest character or merely for beautiful prayers. It may consist of magical rites or on the other hand of a tenuous system of charitable and ethical endeavor with vague intimations of the impossibility of penetrating beyond the veil. But the heart of it all is the mystery inherent in things.

This sense of mystery seemed to baffle man first, as far as actual testimony so far wrested from a fabulously ancient past goes, when he stood by the corpse of the leader who helped him conquer in war. For it was in war that man needed most his genius. The conquests of beasts of prey and animals for food could not have pricked his mental processes beyond the stage reached by the wariest and most cunning animals which had accomplished as much for themselves. Again, however, be it emphasized, that this does not mean that man may not have been dimly aware of mystery when the elements of nature baffled and overpowered him. Teratism may have preceded the incitement of the war-hero's corpse and tomb, in opening man's mind to the elements of religion. But the only evidence from the dim past comes from the grave, the tomb, the dolmen, the megalithic monuments.

Again, teratism, or animatism, or animism, or totemism, or Frazer's pre-religious stage of magic, or taboo seem to imply thoughts far beyond earliest man. Further, none of them seems close enough to the demands of primeval struggle. Food is the fundamental problem of life. Sex is almost equally so. Food and sex questions become acute when life is lived in groups. The mighty, stimulating problem, then, must have been the one of group against group. The array of evidence from Remote Ancestors, so thoroughly supplemented by the bloody tale of Contemporaneous Ancestors with its great homage paid to the powerful ancestors of the Alcheringa, to the war-chiefs, the men with Mana, or to the Only Inca, must reveal how true it appeared and appears to these folk that when they kill their enemies they are serving a most sacred, holy cause. The successful leader of the group seems to be the most natural source for arousing thoughts on the mysterious. This was early man's most pressing need in the life struggle; and it is not insignificant that the only evidence that man pondered on the mysterious in those remote ages should come from the ceremonial burials. Nowhere have any objects been unearthed, connected with the Stone Age, that show man reflecting on the mystery of lightning, thunder, earthquake, volcano, flood and whirlwind. It does seem reasonable to say that these baffling elements must have early stirred within him intimations of that Power so variously called and called upon, by him as well as by our Immediate Ancestors and by men of today. But these did not represent continuously pressing needs. It was leadership that was vital. The man with organizing and executive genius, especially to win the battle, was the man who gave intimations of that greater power which invested everything the great man touched with his Mana.

Whether all religion followed from this, or it was one of the principal

manifestations of the dawning of the religious sense, the all-important fact remains that when religion does appear on the scene, it is the abettor of war. No matter in what part of the globe men of this early estate are studied, they are found spending much, if not most of their time, battling or preparing for battle. Religion enters upon the scene approving, inciting and blessing the hosts that ceremoniously lay weapons about the carefully interred corpse; or that go forth with sacred sticks and stones, the Churinga, the Shaman's box, the dead body of the warrior blessed with Mana, to defeat and slay their enemies. War is primary; religion is essential and secondary to it. Religion finds its usefulness, in great part, throughout this entire period of Remote Ancestors, in insuring the success of its battling votaries.

If it be grudgingly or ungrudgingly agreed that such relations between war and religion were a vital part of the metamorphosis of religion as well as of the social process as a whole, still comfort is often sought by those who show extreme, if not laudable concern for a theory of progress, in the prospect of the marvelous spiritual advance that man was to make in the so-called historic era. Balm is found in the reflection that all beginnings are crude. He who sees the artist merely drawing lines, mixing colors, and making a few daubs, and has never seen complete the inspired work of the artist's vivid imagination, would have, necessarily, but derision for art.

Accordingly one is urged to look at the glorious pictures of the earliest and, more especially, of present-day civilizations. The intimation is that religion will be found to be as qualitatively different from and superior to the attitude assumed to mystery by our Remote Ancestors, as modern scientific man is different from the so-called savage. To satisfy such natural if not just expectations, the light of history is, therefore, turned on the scenes which once filled with such pomp and grandeur the banks of the Nile, Euphrates and Tigris; which reveal Persian pageantry and the perfervid life of India, the quaintness of China and Japan, the dazzling intellectual and artistic eminence of Greece, and the trappings of Imperial Rome, and the mystic visions which the Semite beheld in the barren desert. And the report of these very visions was carried with incredible swiftness by the Roman Eagle with its Hellenistic wings to the north and west, where it was translated into the symbol of the Cross, which has been carried for almost two thousand years by the marching hosts of Christendom in Europe and America. To the south and east the report of these visions was carried by the intrepid rider of the Arabian steed; and made over into the symbol of the Crescent, became the standard of the mighty Mohammedan world.

After one has given regardful attention to this kaleidoscopic view of these nations, which constitute the period of our Immediate Ancestors, one is prepared to form a judgment on the relations of war and religion throughout this second period, compare it with the results found in the case of our Remote Ancestors; and then proceed with an investigation of Contemporaries.

III. War and Religion in Fact: Period of Immediate Ancestors

Section A—Bird's-Eye View of War in the First Part of the Period

Breasted, in his "Ancient Times" says that the men of Stone Age Europe, after fifty thousand years of progress carried on by their own efforts, reached a point, about 3,000 B. C., where they could advance no farther. It is in the Orient, therefore, that he finds the beginning of civilization which is between five and six thousand years old. When Europe acquired the use of metals and writing from the Orient, it was then that civilized leadership both in peace and war shifted slowly from the Orient to Europe[1]. As Thomas waxed eloquent over the inventions of our Remote Ancestors, so Breasted writes enthusiastically about the discovery, by the Egyptians, of the art of writing. This discovery, he says, is "more important than all the battles ever fought and all the constitutions ever devised[2]."

While Egypt was the first to develop highly the arts of peace, its evolution was, nevertheless, marked by internal and external warfare. The first general of history, the greatest of Egyptian conquerors, the Napoleon of Egypt, was Thutmose III, who, about 1500 B. C., waged years of warfare and crushed the cities and kingdoms of Western Asia, solidifying them into an empire. At the same time his war fleet carried his power to the Ægean, and one of his generals became governor of the Ægean Islands[3].

But the palm for the first and highest development of the arts of war is awarded to the civilizations built on the banks of the Euphrates and the Tigris. War was the constant state of affairs in the early history of the Sumerians from about 3050 to 2750 B. C.[4] And most bellicose were their successors, the Assyrians whose state was a vast military machine, "more terrible than any mankind had ever yet seen." The Hittites had introduced iron into Assyria, so that the Assyrian forces were the first large armies equipped with weapons of iron. "The Assyrian Empire, especially in its great military organization, marked a long step forward in the gradual growth of the idea of all-including world-power, which culminated at last in the Roman Empire." And it was the warfare of Assyria that roused the Hebrews to that God-concept which "so profoundly influenced the entire later history of mankind[5]."

But one must hurry to that point at which the author gives one of the most vivid and sweeping views of world-history that it seems possible to find. He limns with a few bold strokes thousands of years of bloody struggle over thousands of miles of territory. He says: "The history of the ancient world, as we are now to follow it, was largely made up of the struggle between this southern Semitic line, which issued from the Southern grasslands, and the northern Indo-European line, which came forth from the Northern grasslands, to confront the older civilizations represented in the southern line. . . . . The two great races face each other across the Mediterranean like two vast armies stretching from Western

Asia westward to the Atlantic. The later wars between Rome and Carthage represent some of the operations on the Semitic left wing; while the triumph of Persia over Chaldea is a similar outcome on the Semitic right wing..... The result of the long conflict was the complete triumph of our ancestors, the Indo-European line, which conquered all along the center and both wings and finally gained unchallenged supremacy throughout the Mediterranean world under the Greeks and Romans. This triumph was accompanied by a long struggle for the mastery between the members of the northern line themselves. Among them the victory moved from the east end to the west end of the northern line, as first the Persians, then the Greeks, and finally the Romans gained control of the Mediterranean and Oriental world[6]."

The gigantic proportions and lengthy duration of these combats compel one to pass by the Hebrews[8], Hittites[9], and Ægean and Greek world[10] [11]. The important thing to note is that war is as all prevalent throughout this, the greater part of the period of our Immediate Ancestors, as it was found to have been among our Remote Ancestors. The critical question concerns the role of religion in the midst of this continuous conflict. The religions, therefore, of Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, Persia, Buddhist India, China and Japan will be rapidly reviewed first. Then will follow an investigation of the religious beliefs of the Greeks, Romans and Semites. Finally, for this period of our Immediate Ancestors, Christianity and Islam will be examined. Of course it must be remembered that this study will limit the observations of all these nations and faiths to the reaction of the respective religionists to war.

Section B—War and Religion Among the Most Ancient of Our Immediate Ancestors. Part 1—The Egyptians

Prehistoric Egyptian life lends color to the generalization drawn from the remains of our Remote Ancestors that it is war which unearths religion, moulds it according to its will, and puts the stamp upon it that makes it current for human circulation. Breasted in his "Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt" seems to confirm distinctly this theory. He says: "As the prehistoric principalities, after many centuries of internal conflict, coalesced to form a united state, the first great national organization of men in history (about 3400 B. C.), this imposing fabric of the state made a profound impression upon religion, and the forms of the state began to pass over into the world of the gods.." "As the arena of thought and action widened from national limits to a world of imperial scope, when the Egyptian state extended to embrace contiguous Asia and Africa, the forces of imperial power continually reacted upon the thought and religion of the empire."

Further detailed examination shows that the main course of the history of the Egyptian religion has to do with the rivalry between the great sun god Re, or by whatever other name he is known, and the great Nile god Osiris[2]. The sun god is the ally and protector of the king, who "hacks up for him all the strongholds of Asia....." The god is a kind of celestial reflection of the earthly Pharaoh. "This phenomenon," adds Breasted, "is, of course, merely a highly specialized example of the uni-

versal process by which man has pictured to himself his god with the pigments of his earthly experience." He finds the Messianic king in Hebrew thought but an analogous process[3]. Moore notes in a similar manner how local political conditions wrought parallel changes in the local gods "under whose banners. . . the rulers of the cantons. . . . fought with one another or against their nominal overlords[4]."

Another strong link binding the religious thinking of our Remote Ancestors with that of the Egyptians is the latter's attitude to death. Breasted asserts that there never was a people among whom the idea of a life beyond the grave held such a prominent place. The excavations disclosing the prehistoric communities along the Nile show that from the fifth millennium B. C. these people must have had an advanced belief in the future life. In the bottom of the pits which these folk dug in the desert gravel, and which were but a few feet in depth, were found thousands of bodies with the "feet drawn up toward the chin surrounded by a meager equipment of pottery, flint implements, stone weapons, and utensils[6]. . ." The theory that ceremonial burial was accorded first and foremost to the chieftain and leader finds some support in Breasted's discussion of the Pyramids. In fine, he says: "The great pyramids of Gizeh represent the effort of the titanic energies absorbing all the resources of a great state as they converged upon one supreme endeavor to sheathe eternally the body of a single man, the head of the state, in a husk of masonry so colossal that by these purely material means the royal body might defy all time and by sheer force of mechanical supremacy make conquest of immortality[7]." A discussion of the "Coffin Texts[8]" and of the "Book of the Dead[9]" follows, but as its trend is essentially in accord with all the preceding, no further mention need be made of the remarkable regard for the dead that characterized the Egyptian religion.

Reference has been made already to the expansion of Egypt into the first stable empire in history, in the sixteenth century B. C. This political growth developed the god-idea to monotheistic proportions. Breasted sizes up tersely the situation in the words: "Monotheism is but imperialism in religion[10]." Egypt proved the truth of this both positively and negatively. The short-lived revolution of Ikhnaton may be said to represent the climax of the monotheistic tendency, built as it was upon the vast conquests of his predecessors. So much for the positive. On the other hand, with the decline of Egypt from the thirteenth century onward, all religious zeal ran into channels of an ever greater increase of mortuary practices and to sacerdotalism. So that religion in Egypt became not only the tool of the state but learnt to covet kingly power[11]. Moore gives the records of this church militant in Egypt with its hereditary priesthood, vast estates and large bodies of troops. Finally in the year 1000 B. C. the Theban high-priest who had been the ruler of the land, boldly set aside the fiction of ruling for the king and seated himself upon the throne[12]. This is the first link in that long chain of evidence presented by history, that when religion secures the reins of government it becomes the servitor of war equally as much as when the laity is the head of the state.

These facts from Egyptian history as gleaned from the prehistoric graves with their implements and weapons as funeral furniture; as read

easily from the gigantic monuments of the Pyramid Age; and as generally noted from the great array of mortuary practices, and from the evolution of sacerdotalism, show that there is an essential connection between war and religion in which religion is secondary; and that for Egypt, this connection was thoroughgoing[13].

As the development of Babylonia and Assyria was synchronous with that of Egypt, war and religion will be briefly investigated in these lands.

Part 2—War and Religion in Babylonia and Assyria

One feels increasingly apologetic for taking the volumes written by erudite scholars to pieces, picking out a few sentences and summaries for substantiating the main ideas presented in these chapters. Thus Jastrow's searching and systematic study on the religion of Babylonia and Assyria contains a great amount of evidence of very special value for this work; but not only will very much of it have to be omitted for fear of wearying repetition and for the sake of space, but even that which will be included must be boiled down to a point almost unpalatable.

Jastrow, like Breasted, emphasizes at the outset, that religion is moulded by political and social forces. The local gods of the Babylonian cities grew as their precincts enlarged[1]. The gods En-Lil, Marduk, Nin-Girsu, Nergal, Nin-ib became either Bel, that is lord par excellence with his worship spread all over Babylonia; or a warrior deity of Bel, and war gods, in proportion as they aided the battling kings to secure victory. Even Shamash, the "god of day," the most continuously popular deity among the Babylonians and Assyrians, and essentially a beneficent deity, puts an end to wickedness and destroys enemies. Of course he does this for the sake of righteousness, to make the weak strong, and prevent the strong from crushing the weak, but be the cause what it will, he is made to serve the ends of war[3]. For both the Babylonians and Assyrians, Ishtar, the chief goddess is essentially a deity of war and battle[4]. Marduk originally a solar deity, sloughs this natural aspect, when he is elevated by the conqueror, Hammurabi, to political headship as the great lord of the city and empire of Babylonia[5] [6]. An examination of the mythologies cannot be included in this broad survey of the religions of the past and present, otherwise most ample material could be found in the mythologies of Egypt and Babylon for the support of the position taken in these pages on the relations between war and religion[7].

Assyria corroborates so fully this contention that it could be dismissed from the witness stand with but a single sentence. Jastrow puts it briefly: "One receives the impression that in Assyria only a few of the gods invoked by the kings at the side of Ashur exert any real influence on the lives of the people; and such as do, gain in favor through possessing in some measure the chief attribute that distinguished Ashur,—prowess in war[8]." Thus Ishtar is primarily "the lady of war, who arranges the order of battle and encourages her favorites to fight[9]." It is extremely worth while to note the attitude of Tiglath Pileser I, who was a great and ruthless warrior. He invokes the aid of the beneficent Shamash, the judge of heaven and earth, "who sees the king's enemies,

and shatters them because of their guilt." Ramman and Marduk also aid the Assyrian hosts to victory[10].

But these mighty warriors had not only lofty ideals of righteousness; they also breathed most beautiful prayers[11]; their penetential psalms touched high levels of religious and ethical thought[12]; and while the Babylonians led in this spiritual development, the Assyrians adopted these psalms as they did other features of Babylonian life and thought, "and enriched the collection by productions of their own, which, however, follow closely the Babylonian models[13]." So one may not speak here of crudities, as one is so apt to in discussing these early forms of religion as manifested in Egypt and Babylon.

Further material to aid the present argument could be found in omen and oracle ritual[14]; in the idea of the divine right of kings[15]; in the sacred calendars[16]; and in the legends[17]. But this will all be passed by to close this part with a sentence on the attitude to death. Jastrow says that there are two remarkable chapters in the Old Testament which illustrate the popular view prevailing in Babylonia as to the condition of the dead in the nether world. "The prophets Isaiah and Ezekiel both portray the dead as having the same form they possessed while alive. The kings have their crowns on their heads; the warriors lie with their swords girded about them..... What distinguished the dead from the living is their inactivity[18]."

Here then is a culture reared by mighty warrior kings who regarded themselves as promoters of justice and lovers of righteousness. The incantation texts denounce hatred, cheating, using false measures, removing boundaries, adultery and insincerity. The Assyrian monarch emphasized the fact that "he established ordinances so that the strong should do no harm to the weak[19]." Yet if war was ever all important, it was surely so in the growth of Babylonia and Assyria. Moore's account of it all reflects the same spirit in his treatment of the religion of these two lands, as that just presented in the work of Jastrow[20]. And the sum of it all, as far as the relations of war and religion are concerned, is but the strongest kind of affirmation of the conclusion reached from the preceding study of the Egyptian religion.

Part 3—The Relations of War and Religion in Zoroastrianism

From Egypt, Babylonia and Assyria, it might seem more logical to turn now to the Semitic, Greek and Roman world. But as these peoples exerted the most powerful influences for the growth of present-day Occidental life and thought, it was thought best to consider them as a whole in the section immediately preceding that dealing with Christianity and Mohammedanism. Further, before approaching so near modernity, it appeared wise to consider the Oriental nations and religions, usually if vaguely held to be saturated with pacifism or quietism.

The manifestations of Aryan religious thought in the Orient will be traced in the growth and spread of Zoroastrianism rather than in the religions of India, which with the exception of a word or two on Buddhism, will not be treated of in this study. For with Moore, one must feel that Hinduism is such a "protean phenomenon; every attempt to

describe it must confine itself to certain salient features, but in so doing runs the risk of making an impression of simplicity and unity which is widely remote from the truth[1]." Further, any discussion of this subject involves the introduction of the deeply abstruse speculations of the Hindu religious philosophies. It is, of course, only just and fair to render every meed of praise and tribute to the lofty spiritual thinking of India. But Moore emphatically shows that such highly abstract philosophies, by their very nature, could appeal to limited circles only. Whatever dilution of them reached the populace did not disturb the inherited religions, the gods of which grew like other gods, through the victories in war of their adherents. "...the Aryan invasion had made Indra the greatest of the gods of the Rig-Veda[2]." Indra became the national god of the Aryans, in their wars with their foes, human and demonic, not as the mighty god of tempests, but as the heroic destroyer of the enemy[3]. Latterly, Civa is the claimant upon the religious attention of the Hindus, sharing this honor with Vishnu. Civa is wholly of the pattern of the warrior god Indra; Vishnu is more civilized[4]. "The rivalry of the religions of Vishnu and Civa has sometimes led to violent collisions, but in the present they live in the main peaceably side by side, with some degree of mutual recognition." Moore regards the climatic environment and the conditions of life as peculiarly potent in the evolution of Hinduism. Moore passes a harsh if not premature judgment on India, as a whole, in saying: "It is not strange that a people who thought so ill of the world should never have played a part in the history of the world, nor have developed a national consciousness in any other form than antipathy to foreign masters[5]." At all events this verdict does not reveal very much of the spirit of quietism; but coupled with the stamp which war placed upon Hinduism, it suggests possibilities of some active role that India can play in the future. If it does, there is everything in the religious tradition to aid the cause.

That environmental conditions have played such a large part in Hindu thought is usually made clear by contrasting it with the Iranian. The latter had the same racial inheritance as the Aryan group that conquered India. But while a luxurious nature softened the fiber of the Aryan in India, bringing him to lead the dreamy life of speculative philosophy, the less favored lands of Iran goaded these Aryans to evolve from the one stock of religious ideas that robust dualism of Zoroastrianism, together with the sturdy qualities needed to conquer an empire and especially to organize and govern it "in a degree matched only by the Roman, whom in other respects also they much resemble." "This strenuous and militant type was not first impressed upon the religion by the Zoroastrian reform; it is rather a characteristic of the popular religion which is impressed upon the higher faith[6]."

M. N. Dhalla, a present-day officiating Zoroastrian priest gives naturally a sympathetic, yet at the same time, a scientific presentation of his faith in his recently published "Zoroastrian Theology." He finds that Zoroaster's faith was assured a following when the king of kings of Iran and his consort were converted. The zealous king made Zoroastrianism a church militant. "The holy wars of religion against Turan and the neighboring countries introduced the Avesta and the sacred Fire into

distant lands[7]." Dhalla is convinced that Zoroastrianism possesses all the best elements making for a world creed. But at best, he finds that it remained only a national religion. He thinks that in addition to making mankind holy and righteous, a religion should aim to make mankind patriotic and heroic. "Zoroaster does not encourage exaggerated unworldliness[8]."

The dualism that is the essential characteristic of Zoroastrianism, lends itself admirably to the ends of war. The Druj, or Lying and Wickedness, is not a mere negation of Asha or Righteousness, but has a positive existence. Zoroaster is unsparing and unforgiving in his crusade against the Kingdom of Druj. The ethics of retaliation are in vogue. The end is the ultimate victory of righteousness which is the goal of humanity[9].

While this phraseology is reminiscent of Babylonian and Assyrian theology, Moore gives the corrective here that Jastrow applied to the other. While one hears much talk about the "holy wars" and wars for and by religion, it is fairly safe to assert that history affords no instance in which the real cause of war was religion. Religion enters to bless the cause of the leaders in war. Thus what Dhalla found to be a holy war, Moore reduces to a conflict between an agricultural civilization and a nomadic barbarism. "....a situation (is here presented) which throws an instructive light on the beginnings of Zoroastrianism[10]." He finds further that Zoroastrianism, like Christianity and Mohammedanism and most other religions, is intolerant; "in the Gathas believers are exhorted to chastise the misbelievers with the sword[11]..." Later this intolerance was shown toward Christianity; but Moore sagely adds that "Political considerations also had a good deal to do with the treatment of Christians, especially after the Roman Empire became Christian[12]."

But this is anticipating. The Persian empire builders gave fervent thanks to Ahura Mazda for victories secured. Both Darius and Xerxes attribute all their success over the enemy to the all-wise Ahura[13]. The Yazatas and Fravashis are in many instances real war divinities. Of the Yazatas, Mithra is the most prominent figure. He measures up to full Martian proportions[14 15]; indeed this very Mithra became the favorite deity of the Roman legions; and Mithraism proved a formidable foe of Christianity until the end of the fourth century[16].

Dhalla gives a picture of the Zoroastrian paradise in which "The beatified souls are attired richly,... women are bedecked with jewelry and..warriors with golden arms....[17]" Moore speaks of the Messianism of the faith. A veritable Armageddon is imagined with Turks, Arabs and Christians making a reign of terror. But a Messiah will be born who with gods and heroes on his side will destroy the heathen and their demon allies. "The triumph of God is in this respect more complete than in Christianity, which leaves hell with the devil and his angels and the wicked in torment forever, an unconquered realm of evil[18]."

While these excelling teachings of Zoroastrianism, which bring this faith into close touch with the religions of the most recent of our Immediate Ancestors, show a complexity and development of ethical doctrine that compares favorably with present-day morals, it must be equally evident that they are none the less bound up with war. The very dualism

of this Iranian faith constitutes a most ready and pliant doctrine for warriors. If there be the good principle and the evil principle, it is most easy to identify oneself with the good principle and impute the possession of evil to the neighbor, outsider or foreigner. Zoroastrianism illustrates likewise the subserviency of religion to war throughout the entire Persian epoch.

Part 4—War and Religion as Reacted to, in Buddhism

Were it not that a very recent book by A. Coomaraswamy on "Buddha and the Gospel of Buddhism" partook more of the spirit of the theoretical and also of the missionary, it would be useful, if only from the negative standpoint, to include a review of it here. For to a degree, it confirms Moore's estimate of the peacefulness of Buddhist teaching; "nowhere else is gentleness in act and speech so exalted[1]." Coomaraswamy wrote his book in the midst of this present-world conflict. He is sure that this dire war will give a great impetus to the study of Buddhism[2]. Its message: "Victory breeds hatred, for the conquered is unhappy[3];" must teach mankind the futility of war. But mankind did not have to wait for Buddhism for this lesson. And the sequel will show how ineffective all of the ideal teachings of this faith have been to eliminate war. On the contrary, Buddhism has followed and blessed the warriors as have other religions.

But even the Buddhistic interpretation of life as essentially evil[4]; its heavens and hells[5]; the author's jugglery with spiritualism[6]; the state of Nirvana realizable only after death[7]; the surrender of the ego[8]; utter indifference to social welfare[9]; the impractical nature of the whole system with consequent concessions to the great majority of professing Buddhists[11], a point, which it has been already noted, Moore had made against these speculative philosophies; direct evidence of Buddhistic intolerance[12 13 14]:—all of these items furnish plenty of grist for a fine grinding of the question as to the inner value of Buddhism as a possible peace factor in human evolution. The Buddhist writings contain most beautiful sayings against hatred and revenge[15]. But other religions had teachings equally as noble. Moore, as usual, gives a clearer explanation of the rise of this faith. Buddhism did not recognize rank or caste in its requirements of admission into the Order[17]. This at once introduces economic and social considerations to explain the rapid spread of this faith in a land such as India where caste lines have ever been most rigid. For the fundamental law for the Buddhist monks, the Ten Commandments, were practically the same for Brahmans and for other heretical sects like the Jains[18].

Nevertheless, it is outside of India that Buddhism can best be studied as a living, working creed. It is the fact and not the theory that is of present interest. So one must turn to China and Japan where Buddhism numbers millions of adherents, to obtain a real estimate of this professedly quietistic faith.

Part 5—War and Religion in China

China did not need to import any doctrines of non-resistance. It was due to Buddhism's ready adaptability to the prevailing religious system,

that it gained a hold on the people of the land. For the rest, Moore's dry remark in connection with this phenomenal spread of Buddha's doctrine gives sufficient explanation of its growth. "...it is impossible to have too many patrons and helpers among the powers above[1]."

In his account of the growth of the Chinese religion, Moore shows the role which warfare played as carried on by the invading Chinese against the aborigines[2]. He defines the religion of China "as a union of nature worship and ancestor worship[3]. The emperor is called the Son of Heaven and is the religious head of the nation[4]. Such direct unions of state and church afford most immediate evidence of the inferior role that religion cannot but play to war. It is true that the teachings of Confucius are beautiful as well as practical. His tomb is one of the holiest places in China. In theory, the worship accorded the Sage is for the sake of emphasizing the supreme value of moral education[5]. But in reality, the Confucian doctrine of loyalty and slavish obedience to the authorities is the more comprehensible reason. While Confucius taught the golden rule in a negative form, he insisted at the same time upon the duty of blood-revenge[6]. Instead of pacifism, then, in China, one is prepared to find the same relations between war and religion, as have prevailed in the religions already reviewed. And Buddhism in China is no exception to this rule.

There is ample material for anti-war programs in the teachings of Moh-Tih and even of Mencius. But in Lao-Tse, an elder contemporary of Confucius one can find the most genuine if not sane philosophy of quietism, that all history seems to afford. But Moore, with both eyes open clearly and frankly on the records of history, says of the Taoist doctrine which developed from Lao-Tse's teachings: "It is obvious that such philosophy made no appeal to the masses of men; its adherents were either speculative thinkers of mystical tendency or contemplative recluses such as existed in China before as well as after Lao-Tse. It was not until later, and after great changes, that Taoism became a popular religion[8]."

The truth of this judgment passed by Moore is abundantly illustrated by J. J. M. DeGroot in his "Sectarianism and Religious Persecution in China," and in his "Religion in China." He desires to explode the error that China is a land of most remarkable and exemplary tolerance. He shows how Confucianism, the State Religion, destroyed the vitality of the Buddhist branch and hindered the growth of Taoism[9]. His analysis of the dualism in the Chinese religion analagous to the Zoroastrian[10]; of the calendar with its war and cannon gods; of the prevailing system of ancestor worship[11]; the bitterness of Confucian oppostion to heresy; and the extended notice given to the peace-destroying doctrines of the Fung-Shui[12] are but similar items of evidence in showing the minor part of religion as against that of war, and at the same time the sanction which religion lends to war.

DeGroot's long and dreary recital of sectarianism and religious persecution in China goes far to establish his claim that the Chinese state was the most intolerant and most persecuting of all earthly governments[13]. The banner of rebellion was raised by the Buddhists, goaded, as they were, by Confucian fanaticism, as DeGroot puts it. "....the history

of Buddha's religion under the Ming dynasty was one of tears and bloodshed[14]." As he quotes from the Chinese official "Law Against Heresy and Sects" he is moved to say that this intolerance "opens our eyes to the truth that even in the Far East the human mind works in the same way as among ourselves; there, as here, it formulates dogmas; there, as here, notions contrary to these dogmas spring up; and so arises "heresy." There, as here, "irrt der Mensch so lange er strebt;" there, as here, in former ages, differences of opinion drives him to violence, and the predominant party oppresses and exterminates other schools of thought[15]."

In the light of the ideals of Buddhism, it is curious to note that the Buddhist sect is the chief object of persecution and is regarded as the mightiest rebel power in the land[16]. Christians were also persecuted until treaties with European powers, in 1858, brought relief[17]. Further reference to this bloody tale must be unnecessary[18]. And one may not digress to note a strange moral or two which the author draws from his extended research.

It remains to conclude, that whatever of quietism or love universal may have been taught in China, whether by a native genius as the unique Lao-Tse, or derived from Buddhist doctrine, it is fair to say that as far as the relations of war and religion in China are concerned, there is substantially no difference from all that has preceded. The government is omnipotent and uses Confucianism for its own ends. Granting every virtue to Chinese Buddhism, there is no evidence to show that quietist doctrines prevailed. Be the ground for fighting the loftiest possible in the estimation of friend and apologist, it is abundantly evident that the Chinese Buddhist mixed politics and religion with the blood of war, even as did the government which aimed to suppress all heresy. If Buddhism in China does not make this overwhelmingly clear, Buddhism in Japan will afford more than enough proof to convince the most unwilling. However high, noble, ideal, pacific or godly the religious doctrine may be, the adherents of such teachings are found to be comparatively as quarrelsome, vindictive and warlike, as the records show our Remote Ancestors to have been.

Part 6—War and Religion in Japan

Moore says that up to the present day, there are few in Japan who are exclusive Buddhists or exclusive Shintoists: "the greater part seek their welfare by both ways[1]." Shinto, which means the "way of the (national) gods" is a word derived from China. It was given to the indigenous religion of Japan in the sixth century to distinguish it from the new and foreign Butsudo, or the "way of Buddha[2]." The Shinto deities are chiefly gods of nature, the sun-goddess being chief. In addition, there are gods who were once men: rulers, heroes or men eminent in various arts and pursuits[3]. W. G. Aston, in his book on "Shinto" refers to it as essentially a religion of gratitude and love. He also speaks of the joyous character of the faith[4]. He states, however, that bad men as well as good might be deified, such as rebels and robbers, citing the case "in our own day (of) the murderer of Mori, the Minister of Education." He

further informs one that there were buried with the more eminent dead, food, weapons, ornaments, vessels, pottery and other valuables[6]. All deities are prayed to, among other things, for the blessing of warlike qualities[7].

As Shinto developed, there grew the need of some visible token of the presence of the god. Such a token is known as a "shintai" or god-body. It varies much in form, but is frequently a mirror, a sword, or bow and arrows[8 9]. One of the most conspicuous of the later Shinto deities is the war god Hachiman. In 1039 he was given a high place in the state religion[10]. Among the offerings deposited at the shrines of the gods are swords, spears, shields, etc.[11] The official liturgy, called norito, includes petitions for the suppression of rebellion, the repulse of invasion and success for the imperial arms[12].

Aston's account of the relations between Shinto and Buddhism[13] will be made to yield to that of Moore's. The latter refers to the Buddhist influence in bringing the medieval warriors to worship Hachiman as the war god. From the eighth century on, the Buddhist monks aspired to rulership as did the Egyptian priests noted before. The monasteries themselves were at strife with one another settling their "controversies over points of doctrine or more worldly issues by force and arms." By the close of the eleventh century the monasteries had large armies and private wars were frequent. "In the civil wars of the period the armies of the church took an active part, and on more than one field proved themselves as hard fighters and as ruthless victors as the doughtiest knights[15]." By the sixteenth century, the emperors had all they could do to suppress the church militant. This accomplished, Buddhism was found most useful in the complete suppression of Christianity[16 17]. The eighteenth century witnessed a deepening of patriotism and with it a revival of pure Shinto. Motoori, who died at the beginning of the nineteenth century was a protagonist in the movement. But Aston feels sure that the present belongs to Buddhism, with Christianity looming on the horizon as a great rival in the future. (References 18 to 21.) One must recall the recent wars of Japan with China and Russia, and its present part in the prevailing world war. Then in the light of all these bloody struggles, in which to no small extent, the Buddhist monk doffed his religious garb to don the soldier's accouterments, the actual, living judgment on Buddhism must be passed. It is found to follow the trail of war as consistently as all other religions have done.

Section B—Part 1—War and Religion Among the Greeks

In "The Higher Aspects of the Greek Religion," L. R. Farnell has a sentence which makes easy the great leap from Japan to Greece. He says: "We have had strong proof from Japan of the social value of ancestor-worship and of the ennobling dead; and we need not doubt that the prospect of such posthumous honors would make the strongest appeal to the self-love of the Hellene and would afford a powerful motive to conduct[1]." This sentence from the heart of the book brings the Greek religionist close to the followers of the various gods already described; and strikes a most responsive chord in harmony with the main theme of

this study, more especially, with that part dealing with the origin of religion among our Remote Ancestors.

For it was the mystery hovering about the chieftain as a living genius so necessary for the survival of the group, and the potency of the memory of his mysterious influence as revived by the special sepulture accorded his otherwise useless dead body, that played some decisive part in creating the religious attitude. The exigencies of the struggles in war wrought greatly from the remote beginnings when megalithic monuments were common, as well as among Contemporary Ancestors with their Mana concepts, for the growth of religious ideas. Later, the gods with their martial spirit plucked violently at the heartstrings of the marching hosts of Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, Persia, India, China and Japan, so that men exalted these gods, in their sacred hymns, from puny city guardians to imperial deities. That the spirits of these deities became large enough to cover the mighty walled boundaries of the vast domains conquered with their help, makes it evident that whatever else worked for religion's spread, war most certainly did. For war found in religion such an electric medium for fusing swiftly into a glowing mass the individual human beings, that it could make, at white heat, horde oppose horde, tribe tribe, nation nation, and empire empire. This has been illustrated by all peoples from the men of the Old Stone Age to the Japanese. The more abundant records of the nearer of our Immediate Ancestors, beginning with the Greeks, bring this ceaseless interaction between war and religion, with war having the master hand, down to the very present day.

Greece may include for the purposes of this study the testimony of the Cretan or Minoan civilization. Ample justification for this is found in J. E. Harrison's "Themis[2] [3]." Moore also noted the Cretan connections of the infant Zeus[4]. Harrison speculates on Greek origins along the lines of Durkheim's interpretation of the religion of the Australian Aborigines[5]. There is direct quotation of phrases that represent primitive gods, to a large extent, as collective enthusiasms[6]. Of immediate value is the author's interpretation of the hoplolatry of the Greeks. A weapon does not, of necessity, owe its sanctity to a god, but a case is cited in which a god grew out of a weapon[7]. So much for origins.

Difficulties similar to those encountered in reading Jevons were found in the material offered by Farnell in his work on "The Higher Aspects of the Greek Religion[8]." He appears at first to yield, but grudgingly, recognition to the power of war as against that of religion[9] [10]. But once well in his book, it is found that "Neither in Greek ethics nor Greek religion can we say that courage apart from its patriotic exercise on the battlefield receives any recognition. . . " The closest association of a noble bravery "with religion was attained by the practice of awarding heroic honors to the patriot who fought and died bravely for his country[11]". Other tendencies of similar purport are noted[12]; and again be it observed that the Greek's social creed showed extreme zeal for the morality and religion associated with his family hearth and family tomb. Farnell closes with this thought on Homer: ". . . a poet who in defiance of omens and superstitions could utter the great phrase, 'Best of omens is it to fight for one's native land,' was capable of shaking off the fetters of con-

ventional tribal thought and of penetrating to the heart of things moral and religious[13]."

Moore's bird's-eye view of the entire Greek development makes most clear the relations of war and religion among these intellectual giants of the past. Thus Zeus, the chief god, had as one of his oldest titles Herkeios, the Zeus of the Fort[14]. Apollo is in part a helper and defender in the fight. Hermes, closely related to Apollo, is, among other of his activities, the patron of thieves, traders and orators[15]. A deity for such purposes reminds one not only of the Japanese custom noted above, but also of the religious professions of the Thugs of India. This is an extreme illustration of Haddon's phrase: "As are men, so are gods." Moore has an observation to the same effect[16].

Athena is the warrior maiden representing the superior mind and skill in the art of war rather than brute force. Ares is the warrior god who loves fighting for its own sake and was universally worshipped. Hephaistos is the special patron of smiths and armorers[17]. It is war that brought the principal Greek deities together for the campaign against Troy[18]. Similarly, it was the social, economic and political changes in Greece that affected profoundly the Greek religion[19].

A word or two may be devoted to the Greek philosophers[20]. While they were far from being pacifists, they were assailed by the people, especially when war threatened, because they undermined faith in the gods. When Greece was delivered from the Persian invader, the gods became more than ever beloved and "Athens especially in the meridian of her short century of glory became a very city of the gods[21]." Moore brands this persecution of the Athenian state, directed against the philosophers and scientists, as the work of "malevolent orthodoxy;" adding: "The inquisitores haereticae pravitatis have been the blind tools of a tragic irony[22]."

That these great thinkers were not opposed to war as such, may be seen in the life of a Socrates who had conscientious scruples, not against performing all his duties as a citizen in war and peace, but against taking an active part in politics[23]. Plato's "Republic" may deprecate teaching the Homeric tales of the fighting gods to children[24]. But highly curious is the method to be used for instilling into the children those qualities that make for the brave, successful warrior[25]. As for the rules of warfare —Socrates is made to say that "our citizens ought to adopt these rules in conduct towards their adversaries, while I would have them behave to barbarians as the Greeks now behave to one another[26]." The state must be ruled by such "kings who have shown the greatest ability in philosophy and the greatest aptitude for war[27] [28]."

Whether one investigates, therefore, the popular religion of Greece, or the works of its profound thinkers, the arbitrament of war is a decisive factor for the faith and logic of that remarkable people who, though few in numbers, were yet so influential in their own and succeeding times. In turning to Rome, one may question the necessity of devoting anything but passing attention to its history. Its powerful soldier hosts marched victoriously from the wilds of Britain and Gaul and Germany to distant Egypt and Parthia with the blessings of their gods. The spell of the Cæsars, and the phrase: "The Holy Roman Empire," are so near

and so lilting on the tongue, that as brief as possible an account of the relations of war and religion among the Romans ought to suffice.

Section B, Part 2—War and Religion Among the Romans

It was stated in the introduction that no books were found among the many that treated of war and religion that dealt with the question from the scientific standpoint, except two small volumes; and that these were limited to a consideration of a corollary of this subject. Both of these books deal with the religion of the Roman army—the one bearing directly on this topic, the other concerned with a theory of religion in general. Renel takes for granted the war basis for the origin and growth of Rome, and the military cults connected therewith[1]. Von Domaszewski records with most painstaking details the methods used in having the Roman religion accompany the soldiers in all of their campaigns[2] [3]. He shows how the fates of certain divinities depended upon the outcome of the military expedition[4]. This material needing but little more than a reference or two to it, ought to enable one to dismiss Rome forthwith. But the Roman spirit is still so prevalent in the world that more extended notice of its wars and its religion is called for. Fowler it is, who says, that "to this day the Catholic Church in Italy retains in a thinly disguised form many of the religious practices of the Roman people[5]."

Jupiter protected the state in war as well as in peace. As war with neighbors was almost as regular a part of the year's business as sowing and reaping, the gods of battle, Mars and Quirinus, were very prominent in the pantheon[6]. Again Moore comments on the power of the state in making the gods[7]. The calendar recorded festivals and holy days marking the chief occupations of the people as husbandry and war[8]. Disasters, especially war, caused the introduction of foreign deities[9]. Generals had haruspices on their staff to help in the campaign[10]. The climax of all this testimony may be found in the emperor cult[11] [12].

The rapid spread of the Mithra cult in and by the Roman army has been mentioned before[13]. Moore makes very vivid the story of the opposition of the Christian Fathers to this Oriental cult and their zeal in destroying the Mithraea[14]. Cumont shows how the military monarchies of the East "placed in the forefront the warriors who died sword in hand in defence of their country. . ;" quoting Horace to the effect that to such heroes the gates of heaven are opened[15].

In Fowler's "The Religious Experience of the Roman People," an interesting suggestion is made in connection with the evolution of the familia and the pagus. He connects the latter term with "pax," making the pagus a territory within the bounds of which there is pax[16] [17] [18]. The earliest religious document of Rome, the calendar of Numa, reflects the change of the Roman people from an agricultural to a highly organized political and military City-state[19] [20] [21] [22].

It is of supreme importance to find that these essentially militaristic Romans regarded themselves and their ancestors as "religiosissimi mortales." Thus Cicero says that the Romans as compared with other peoples were far superior "in religione, id est cultu." In one of his orations, he says: "We have overcome all the nations of the world, because

we have realized that the world is directed and governed by the will of the gods." In the age of Augustus, Dionysus asserted that "one needed to know the pietas of the Romans in order to understand their wonderful career of conquest[23]."

Mere mention of the art of divination, which extended in practice into the Christian period, having been countenanced, as most always for war purposes by a Bishop of Rome, is all that should be necessary here. The attitude of the Romans to the gods after the defeat of the Carthaginians was entirely similar to that of the Athenians when they were saved from the Persian menace[25]. The name of Polybius should at least be given because his theory that religion was invented for political objects is a crude, cynical anticipation of the ends of this entire study[26]. Fowler devotes a large part of the close of his book to Vergil's Æneid. The pietas of his hero is proved by the success that came to his arms. As the animadversions of Lactantius on this kind of pietas in contrast to the Christian's peace interpretation of pietas will be included generally in a following chapter, no further notice of it here is needed[27]. Fowler, in a more recent book on "Roman Ideas of Deity" gives but parallel evidence of all that is contained in the "Religious Experience[28]."

It is plain, then, that this account of war and religion among the Romans is most convincingly similar to all that has gone before. It was not the call of religion that incited the Roman generals and their cohorts to pursue their policy of world conquest. If the anthropomorphism is pardoned, it may be said that it was war that beckoned on these well-drilled armies; and the worth of the gods was tested by the victories brought to the arms of the Cæsars.

The closing part of this chapter will give a brief outline of the bearing of the Semites, in their reactions to war and religion, on this study. For together with the Greeks and Romans, the Semitic ideas play a prominent part in the Christian and Mohammedan development.

Section B, Part 3—War and Religion Among the Semites

W. R. Smith, in his "Religion of the Semites" repeats the more than familiar refrain that religion did not exist for the saving of souls "but for the preservation and welfare of society[1]." Another commonplace, as far as this study is concerned, is the incessant warfare of ancient times. The small Semitic groups were separated from each other by continuous feuds. The local god of the clan or town was an enemy to the enemies of his votaries. Smith says that the Old Testament testifies abundantly to the truth of this. He cites the history of David and of Ruth; phrases such as the "enemies of Jehovah;" and that the ark of the Lord was taken into battle by the Israelites[2]. His conclusion is that religion did not lead the way to raise morality to higher ideals but was content to follow or even to lag behind[3].

The Semitic communities were chiefly interested to secure from their god three things: help against their enemies, counsel by oracles or soothsayers in matters of national difficulty, and a sentence of justice when a case was too hard for human decision. Smith finds also, that what is described as a tendency toward ethical monotheism, is in the

main, nothing more than an alliance of religion with monarchy. While the prophets rose above this, religion in practice did not follow in the steps of these spiritual giants. So that the case here is analogous to the situation in other lands where a Socrates or Buddha or Lao-Tse spoke most lofty sentiments but the stream of life was undisturbed by them[4 5]. And while the prophets gave to the world the Messianic visions of peace, it is a matter for debate as to what their immediate attitude to war was. The doctrine that God uses the mighty conquering nations to crush a people for its sins is also prophetic. After all, however, this again is theory, and it is the fact that is now to be sought.

In view of the indirect attention to be given the Jewish interpretation in the succeeding chapters, it may be considered vain to dwell on the din of warfare that fills so much of the Bible, or to spend any time on the speculations or aphorisms of the rabbis. (See references 6, 7 8 and 9.) A. Cronbach finds that Judaism affords nowhere an anti-militaristic interpretation of the Biblical passages favoring world peace... "On the whole Judaism appears rather to disagree than to agree with Socialism in this particular." Judaism is entirely "too nationalistic to be in sympathy with internationalism or to be anything but indifferent to world peace." This is the verdict of Jewish history despite the fact that there is a wealth of beautiful maxims and teachings on peace[10].

This completes the second section of this chapter that deals with war and religion among our Immediate Ancestors. Beginning with the Egyptians, and observing in turn the Babylonians and Assyrians, the Persians, Hindus, Chinese and Japanese, the Greeks, Romans and Semites, the general testimony yielded abundant proof to establish war as the primary factor, holding religion fast in its machinery as a most energetic and faithful aid to weave the bloody garment which humanity has draped about itself.

The closing section of this chapter will deal with the Mohammedan and most extensively with the Christian groups, for they have practically dominated the stage of history from the fall of Rome to the present day. In fact, the relations between the groups professing these two religions, have followed closely the magnificently sweeping view, given by Breasted at the beginning of this chapter, of the mighty battle line stretching along either side of the Mediterranean. Warfare has been all but continuous for these sixteen centuries within these groups and between them. This period will be treated then as a unit.

Section C—War and Religion Among Christian and Mohammedan Peoples

Because these sixteen hundred years of history to be surveyed are such an intimate part of the life of the Western nations, one is tempted to accord considerably more space to them than has been granted the preceding peoples. But when all is said and done, the great amount of literature on the subject can and must be reduced to simplest, narrow proportions so as not to destroy the balance of these pages and to avoid too much wearisome repetition. To facilitate this process, the Cambridge Medieval History and the Cambridge Modern History will be used

almost exclusively in this section to show the attitude of the Christian and the Mohammedan to war and religion.

The Greek and Roman parts of the preceding section are brought well into the heart of the Christian evolution in noting that "the greatest power of the world—that Eastern Roman Empire.... carried down the old Græco-Roman civilization almost to the end of the Middle Ages[1]." The outstanding figure of this Byzantine Empire is Constantine. The great question he had to face was with reference to the position to be assumed to the rising power of the Christians. This was the immediate concern of practical politics at the beginning of the fourth century. Passing note only may be taken of the story of the "Shining Cross" with its words "Hoc Vince" that have played so large a part in militant Christianity[2]. With all due regard for the noble character of Constantine, and the lofty faith and morals of the Christians, it was a matter of expediency and not the avowal of some divine aim that linked the causes of the Eastern Empire and Christianity, with Christianity in the minor role. For Constantine handled all the difficult sides of the question with such great skill, that he not only "made the Christians thoroughly loyal, but won the active support of the churches, and obtained such influence over the bishops, that they seemed almost willing to sink into a department of the State[3]." The best evidence for this is seen in the conduct of the œcumenical council which the great emperor convoked. Constantine wanted the Nicæan Council, assembled in 325, to eliminate the theological disputes that threatened Christian unity. He threw his influence into the sessions to make decisions unanimous rather than to turn the representatives one way or the other. If there was uniformity in religion, the Church could then be more useful to the State. For his labors to these ends, he was buried in the cathedral of the Twelve Apostles; and the Greek Church to this day calls him "Isapostolos"—equal to the Apostles[4].

One could devote much space to these factional struggles that marked the early days of the Church. The Arianist, or Donatist, or others, opposed and were opposed by the Church Catholic not merely with spiritual weapons. But after all, these quarrels were only by-products of the long-drawn-out bloody struggles between the Teutonic Tribes and the Imperial forces of the Eastern Empire. The growth of the hierarchy in the Church of Rome[5]; the factional fights of the Roman Bishops for place and power[6], and the political currents that turned men to Rome and away from Jerusalem[7] cannot detain one now. Of more pressing importance are the relations of the Church with the Goths, Franks, Vandals, and Teutons, and the battles of these latter with the Altaian Asiatic hordes that swept into Europe. Europe of the fourth and fifth century is all turmoil and warfare. It presents a panorama of imperial ambitions, tribal groupings and shiftings, ceaseless enmity between the Church and all it regarded as heretic. Policies of state and religion are inextricably tangled but it was the lure of dominance that led men on. Both Emperor, Ecclesiastic and even so-called barbarian held in the left hand the Bible which contained many a vision of godly peace and love; but in the right hand was the sword. That is, war led as the primary factor and religion seconded war throughout. "The influence of the Empire upon the internal and external structure of the Church had been felt from the first.....

The bargain proposed by Nestorius to Theodosius II, "Give me the world free from heretics and I will give thee heaven," was in a fair way of fulfillment." These foundations of European thought and action were consistently built upon by succeeding generations up to this very period of Contemporaries. (See references 8 to 13.)

Accordingly it is no surprise to find Justinian, in the sixth century, the great representative of what has been called "Cæsaropapism." He realized the political importance of an agreement with the Papacy. He issued, therefore, the severest laws against heretics. "Religious intolerance was transformed into a public virtue.[14]" This career of Justinian in the East was matched by that of Clovis in the West. Clovis perceived the strength he would gain by embracing Christianity, for the Bishops helped him not only in his warfare "against the heathen tribes but also against the barbarians who adhered to the Arian heresy[15]."

It should not be difficult to imagine what a perfect maelstrom of blood would ensue if these martial-religious rapids of Europe were to be caught in the whirl of another warrior group, with a radically different religion accompanying it, as it foamed in battle. That was what happened when the followers of Mahomet appeared upon the scene at the end of the sixth century, and in mighty floods during the seventh and succeeding centuries.

It is said that Mahomet rose above the concept of an ethical code based on tribal patriotism. He emphasized "the universal obligations of morality, and above all the duty of forgiving injuries instead of avenging them[16]." He recognized the ancient principle of blood-revenge but tried to confine it within narrow limits. He did not take part in the fighting but "remained in a small hut which had been erected for him, praying with passionate fervor and trembling violently." One of his regulations was that all Moslems capable of bearing arms might under certain circumstances be required to serve as soldiers[17].

In a short time he had subjugated the whole of Arabia, and then in the flush of his power, he looked beyond the Arabian world. In 629, "Islam for the first time came into conflict with the great Christian power against which it was destined to struggle with scarcely any intermission, for a period of eight centuries[19]."

This struggle represents another phase of the age-long warfare between the men of the southern grasslands, as Islam spread along the southern shore of the Mediterranean, and the Christian populations along the northern littoral. This struggle was not for the sake of religion, but again it was religion abetting the ends of the expanding Saracens and Teutons, whose movements "form the basis of the history of the Middle Ages." It was not Christianity nor even the Teuton, but internecine strife in the young Arabian empire that led to its defeat. Nor was it religion that drove the Saracens forward, but "hunger and avarice." The function of religion was to supply "the essential unity and central power. Expansion of the Saracen's religion both in point of time and in itself can only be regarded as of minor import and rather as a political necessity[20]." And a contrast drawn between the followers of Christianity and those of Mohammedanism, leaves a balance, as far as their actions are concerned, in favor of neither[21].

Turning to Northern Europe, one may hurry by Celtic and Germanic heathenism with its war gods, Valholl, Valkyries, Vikings and megalithic monuments. The evidence they bring has been abundantly if indirectly, treated in the preceding chapters[22].

Of more moment are the relations of Charles the Great and the Papacy. While this entire narrative reveals again the subordinate position of Christianity, it is most striking to see the subjection of the Pope to Charles even in matters of Church doctrine. The Holy Father is merely expected to support the royal work by his prayers. Charles is styled: "The Representative of God who has to protect and govern all the members of God, Lord and Father, King and Priest, the Leader and Guide of all Christians." In stating the significance of Charles for the history of the world, it is important to read that it consisted in his transferring of the theocratic idea of absolute sovereignty from the sphere of the Roman Curia to the Frankish State. "He prepared the way for the social institution peculiar to the Middle Ages, and at the same time opened the source of unavoidable wars[23]." It is not an exaggeration to say that practically every page of this ponderous volume, more especially the chapters dealing with the development of the Empire of Charles, its dissolution into the feudal system, the growth of the papacy, the overwhelming of the Eastern Empire by the Mohammedan power, and the great split of the Church into the Eastern or Greek Rite as against the Western, Roman or Catholic Rite: every page yields proof for the substantiation of the central ideas of this study on war and religion. To abbreviate it all, one short sentence may be included from the closing chapter of this second volume of the Cambridge Medieval History. "More and more the divisions of the Church were becoming tokens of national rather than religious sympathy[24]."

This anomalous position of the Church is portrayed again and again throughout the twelve books of the Cambridge Modern History. Its opening generalization deals with the great distinction of the modern world as being "its frank recognition of nationality, and all that it involves." And the starting point of modern history is "the plain issue of a competition between nations." In the large, therefore, modern history should furnish overwhelming evidence of the vital importance which religion was to these national governments, for warfare has been practically incessant throughout this modern period[25].

The discoveries resulting from the efforts of the intrepid voyagers who sailed the seas at the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth centuries, gave Europe visions of dazzling wealth[26]. Utopian dreams that were comparatively idealistic, and wider visions of world domination, alike filled men's minds[27]. But the lure of power exerted the greater force as the modern era advanced on its way.

If the feverish materialism with which the discovery of the New World inoculated men is not lost sight of, one is prepared to hear with equanimity that the great ocean-going Genoese "were accustomed to dealings with the Ottomans: they were the first Christian powers west of the Adriatic that had made a treaty with them, and they had not scrupled to use the alliance of the infidels against their fellow-Christians." As for Venice, "her first thought was not to recover the bulwark of Christendom

from the hands of the Muslim, but to preserve her own commercial privileges under the rule of the infidel sovereign[28]."

This directs attention to the southern grass lands, to watch the triumphal course of Islam near to the heart of Europe. As internecine war among the Muslims had afforded Europe a breathing spell which the European nations had used to fight among themselves, so now the chain of events connected with the irrevocable break between Rome and Luther gave the Muslims an opportunity for successful incursions northward. Luther, taking his cue in all probability from ancient prophetic doctrine, declared that the invading Turk was a visitation of God upon the Papacy. To resist the Turk, therefore, was to resist God. But some years later, when the infidel directly menaced Germany, Luther agreed to war against the Turks. He was somewhat embarrassed to explain away his previous utterances[29]. Islam was more consistently militaristic than Luther. The code of Ibrahim enjoins the conquest of unbelievers who must be "converted to Islam, subjected to tribute, or destroyed by the sword[30]."

The kaleidoscopic turn of events does not permit one to be detained for any length of time at any point. The clash of arms attracts attention, now here, now there. "Greed, ambition, the lust of battle, the interests of dynasties, such are the forces that seem to rule the fate of Italy and Europe. Yet amidst this chaos of blind and soulless strife the scheme and equilibrium of the western world is gradually taking shape[31]."

If time and space do not permit a close inspection of all this turmoil from which the nations were born, it can hardly be expected that individuals could arise so far above the melee as to claim even momentary attention. For this reason Savonarola's life cannot be considered though there is much in it of value for this study[32]. But Machiavelli mirrors, in his works, so much of the thought and methods that form the basis of modern history, that a word or two cannot but be devoted to him.

Machiavelli was convinced that human nature was essentially depraved and that imitation rather than initiative was the rule of life. He believed, "like Bacon, that wars are necessary as a national tonic, peace is disrupting and enervating;. . . . .war and fear produce unity." At the same time, Machiavelli firmly believed in religion. The Church was to be the great helpmate of the state. Any community which lost or misdirected the religious sentiment greatly weakened itself and "imperiled its own existence." The State was the be-all and end-all of existence. The art of government was not a matter of right or wrong but the welfare and contentment of the majority of the inhabitants. As the State was for all, so all must be for the State. ". . .where the bare salvation of the motherland was at stake, there no consideration of justice or injustice can find a place, nor any of mercy or cruelty, or of honor or disgrace; every scruple must be set aside, and that plan followed which saves her life and maintains her liberty[33]."

The events transpiring in Europe in the time of Machiavelli proved that his "Prince" was not a monstrosity of the imagination, but a reflection of actualities, if not a somewhat pale one at that. The Papal Temporal power by no means set the pace for cruelty and rapacity. Whatever its original association with the Inquisition, this mighty engine against

heresy was after all "an eccelsiastical instrument in the hands of the civil power[34]." Again it was the political power, with its incessant warring throughout this modern era, that made possible the formulation of such doctrines as Machiavelli enunciated. Such theorists then as Machiavelli, Erasmus and Grotius must be left by the wayside for an inspection of the grim chronicles of the Reformation.

The Reformation is generally regarded as wholly and entirely a religious movement.

But the verdict of history will not have it so. For while it is bewildering to trace the currents and counter-currents of the turbulent days of Luther, it is stated that "the motives, both remote and proximate, which led to the Lutheran revolt, were largely secular rather than spiritual." Indeed it is affirmed that the religious changes were incidental; "they were not the object sought but the means for attaining that object[35 36]."

In the first place the Church had become thoroughly secularized. Further, the sale of indulgences represented in its final analysis an economic oppression of the masses. It is said to be reasonable to conclude that "in its essence the Reformation was due more largely to financial than to religious considerations[37]." But the most bitter antagonism was aroused by the power which the Church exercised of "demanding a tithe of all ecclesiastical revenue whenever money was needed under the pretext, generally, of carrying on the war with the infidel." Finally, "the world has rarely seen a more debased standard of morality than that which prevailed in Italy in the closing years of the Middle Ages." When Cardinal Borgia, as Vice Chancellor, was reproved for openly selling pardons for crime, he replied, "that God desires not the death of the sinners, but that they should pay and live[38]."

It matters little, however, as far as the object sought in these pages is concerned, whether the religious or secular element is emphasized in the genesis of the Reformation. The thing that stands out most clearly is that the men who were most vehement in their religious professions were at the same time the most cruelly bitter in their warfare. A writer in the second volume of "The Cambridge Modern History" thinks that while the "main defect in the earlier histories of the Reformation has been the neglect of the secular sides of the movement, it is possible that more recent historians have been apt to ignore the religious element which was a real power[39]." This is perhaps the strongest statement found, in this monumental work, that pleads for the recognition of the true power of religion. Since it is such an exception, it may be looked upon rather as symptomatic of the traditional feeling that yearns to find the ideals of religions actualized intensively in the life of humanity, but pathetically fails in the search.

For the succeeding record shows all-abundantly how secondary was the role which religion played throughout the Reformation. Luther's reversal of policy, noted before in connection with the Mohammedan invasion, could be further illustrated in his varying attitude to the constituted authorities versus the masses. It is said that he virtually saved the Reformation by deserting the cause of the peasants and allying himself with the triumphant princes[40].

During the decade following the Peasants' Revolt, numerous sectaries

arose that repudiated Luther's views, denouncing more especially the dependence of the Lutheran Church upon the State. They withdrew from participation in worldly affairs; and some, anticipating the Quakers, refused to bear arms. "Many were beheaded in Saxony with the express approbation of Luther, who regarded their heroism in the face of death as proof of diabolic possession[41]." In lieu of giving the details concerning these sectaries, the next chapter will contain a sketch of the Quakers. Enough it is to say here that this drab narrative, showing both the robust strength of Luther and his weakness, is all confirmatory of the main contention. There is practically no room left to argue that religion took the lead in these stirring events. It appeared rather as a very sorry second to the State in asserting the duty of rendering unto Cæsar the things of Cæsar. The sectaries that survived this bloody, intolerant age did so in proportion as they became, slowly, "respectable creeds[42]." The upshot of it all may be reduced to the generalization that "in the sixteenth century every movement tended to assume a theological garb, and the rich naturally favored conservative forms of religion, while the poor adopted novel doctrines[43]."

If it be granted that the Reformation had such an animus, such a spirit behind it, one need not follow closely, in this study, the dreary and weary lengths of this great upheaval through Switzerland, France, the Netherlands, England and elsewhere. ". . .Europe was doomed to be the battlefield of contending principles. The sword alone could be the arbiter[44]." It matters little how much this dread sentence prepares one for the reading of the blood-curdling narrative; the awful events themselves leave the investigator speechless with the horror of it all. History affords no more sordid tale of intriguing religion and Machiavellian politics than that which describes the few remaining centuries from the time of the Reformation until the present day. For some, there may be found a crumb of comfort in the dictum that "The Renaissance was not necessarily secular and classical—it might be and often was both religious and Christian; nor was the Reformation essentially religious and moral—it might be and often was political and secular[45]."

"The Wars of Religion" is the significant title of the third volume of the Cambridge Modern History. But a word of preface affords a commentary on this title which makes it only too evident that the wars were not of, by or for religion, but were the play of dynastic ambitions in which religion was used as a faithful ally[46].

This is proved first and most dramatically by the St. Bartholomew massacres[47] [48]. These massacres left France a bloody legacy. During the succeeding years, the "picture of demoralization could hardly be matched in the records of any period; . . . .nor was there much to choose between Catholics and Huguenots, though of the few serious-minded men who have left any record, the majority are perhaps to be found among either the Protestants or the Politiques[49]." Montaigne, the contemporary witness of those debased times, remarked: "Pick out from the Catholic army all the men who are actuated either by a pure zeal for religion or by loyalty to their country or their Prince, and you will not find enough to form one complete company[50]."

For the sake of brevity one may dismiss the highly interesting and

valuable testimony on the course of the Reformation in Poland in order to dwell a little longer on the larger, more spectacular phases of the struggle[51].

One turns, therefore, to the greater issues and to the continent-encircling view of Breasted, to watch again the Ottoman plot and fight his way into the north with direct co-operation of the north. In 1536, France made a treaty of alliance with Turkey. Scandalous as this was to the times, "it would have been infinitely greater had it been known, or even suspected, that Solyman's siege of Vienna was the result, as the Grand Vezir Ibrahim revealed to Ferdinand's ambassador, of an appeal to the Sultan from Francis, his mother Louise of Savoy, and Clement VII, for help against the Emperor." The conclusion drawn was that there was little to choose between Turk and Christian when the virtues and vices of both were weighed in the balance[52]. This judgment is made in the full light of the admission that "The Ottoman Empire was a military State;" having as its mission "the spread of Islam by fire and sword[53]. . " To pass from such an agreement between Christian and Turk to discuss Spain's Invincible Armada would be in the nature of anti-climax. For here it is Catholic against Protestant, but withal, both Christians; whereas in the other it was Mohammedan linked with Christian against Christian[54 55].

The solution of these tangled series of events is found in the theories of Machiavelli. While his name "became a byword in Europe for all that was unscrupulous and dishonest in politics,... his maxims are those which have governed the practice of statesmen in general for the last three hundred years. Machiavelli it may be noted, knows nothing of chivalry, and even less of the Sermon on the Mount. Do to others, not as you would they should do to you, but as you suspect they would like to do to you, is his principle of government." "The Church which presently condemned Machiavelli's writings showed itself an adept in his methods. That the end justifies the means, and that the prudent ruler will seek to be feared rather than loved, were maxims in favor no less with the spiritual than with the temporal powers." As for the Church, it may be noted that in the institution of the Congregations, of which there were fifteen, one, the first was that of the Inquisition or the Holy Office; and another was "The Congregation for the navy which saw to the construction and armament of vessels ordered by the Pope and to the security of the seashore..." As for the State, the ambitious policies of Philip "had opened the eyes of the most infatuated Catholics to the fact that notwithstanding his real devotion, religion was with him only a means for the establishment of his political supremacy in Europe.....[56]"

All of these facts in the history of war and religion cannot but form uniform links with the preceding parts, and so make a section of that long chain of evidence which stretches far back into the time when man unconsciously made records of his deeds in the stone weapons and implements he found or fashioned. A fitting nexus in this chain was wrought by the proud achievements of the pyramid builders on the Nile and of the men who reared the hanging gardens on the Euphrates. The scenes would appear to shift radically with the advent of such leaders of the type of Moses, Zoroaster, the Jewish Prophets, Lao-Tse, Confucius, Buddha, Jesus and Mohammed, all of whom gave teachings of ethical import; and

in many instances, with frequent and direct emphasis against war, though not constantly, consistently and intransigeantly so. But withal, the teachings of these master minds were used continually by their followers to fan the flames from which were forged greater chains to belt the mighty nations and empires that went forth to battle to keep intact or extend their frontiers because they were assailed by, or felt impelled by whatever reason, to assail their neighbors. The bloody warfare of the Dark and Middle Ages of Europe and of the Mohammedan world that has filled this section, showed how religion gladly devoted its energies to the campaigns carried on with never-ceasing fury. And the iron of battle in the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries fashioned identical parts for this chain that either has kept bound all peoples in its unbreakable shackles; or, to follow the interpretation of another school of thought, the chain which humanity has felt bound ever to hold aloft as the symbol of its freedom, despite its crushing weight of stone and iron, inspired by that mysterious power variously called upon in the remote and immediate past, and generally known in the present, as God.

Granting it is clear that the Reformation made for the breaking up of the European continent into jealous nationalist groups led by ambitious dynasties[57] with the consequent exaltation of power as the basis of the modern State[58], one may neglect here further mention of the unremitting warfare of kings and emperors, of French Revolution and Napoleonic conquest. With all due allowances made for the influence of high ideals, ennobling thoughts, and what are regarded as the best ethical, religious and spiritual values, it is most evident that if a nation decided to make war, its ideas or ideals in so doing were found consonant with the various religions of the peoples composing that nation. In no less fervent degree, did the very same religionists in the country attacked, find fullest realization of their hopes and faiths in the cause of their own lands, which had been invaded. Churches of the same denominations in all countries used the same prayer-books and hymns and rituals to lend ardor to the men who fought for their country. Whether Church and State were divided or not, the result was invariably the same. Force was the ultimate sanction; and all other agencies had to lend their sanctions to force. Religion, as one of those agencies seems to have followed, therefore, what appears to be a law as immutable as that of gravitation, in its unfailing support of war. For up to the present point in this study, as long as man has been identified as such on this earth, he has been found to be a fighter; and what developed into no mean aid as part of his warring equipment, has been this strange, mysterious, psychological power of religion, that assured him of his working, of his fighting in harmony with the power, the mystery that is at the heart of this universe.

A very vivid illustration of this relationship between war and religion that should constitute a most striking close of this section devoted to our Immediate Ancestors may be found in the history of the great American Civil War. The Methodist Book Concern published, in 1912, a work called "The Methodist Episcopal Church and the Civil War." In his preface, the author disclaims any object of glorifying the Church "because of the important part she took in the Civil War, but it was to tell in a scientific manner just what the Methodist Episcopal Church, taken as a

typical example of the other Churches did in aiding the Federal Government to bring to a successful close the War of the Rebellion. The thesis of this study is to show the importance of the Churches as an aid to the Government during the Civil War[59 60 61]."

Unfortunately the book is not completely scientific for it does not show as fully in the case of the South how the Churches there supported the cause of the Confederacy as it shows how the Churches North upheld the Union. Slight compensation for this lack may be found in the impartial way in which is traced the evolution of the northern churches from opposition to abolition of slavery to espousal of it[62 63 64].

Hardly could a more perfect instance of the loyalty of religious groups to the established authorities be cited than that afforded by the Civil War. Just because the issues were so very decidedly and clearly drawn, this fierce struggle was most illustrative of the typical attitude to war and religion. Whether the accent be placed on the question of slavery or on the more theoretical one of States' rights, the very same churches in different sections of the country took diametrically opposite sides. They found in their same prayer-books, and above all, in one and the same Bible, divine sanction for the support they gave to their leaders and armies drawn up for battle. Warfare was to be the arbiter.

The book contains a copy of the written reply which Lincoln made to a delegation from the General Conference which presented an address to him. Lincoln lauded the Methodist Episcopal Church above all others. He closed his reply with the words: "God bless the Methodist Episcopal Church! Bless all the Churches! And blessed be God, who in this great trial giveth us the Churches. (Signed) A. Lincoln[65]."

When the war ended, the religious bodies remained split into Churches North and South[66]; and despite all efforts making for unity, the various branches maintain their separatism to the present day. All Church publications in the North supported the Union cause during the war[67]; and all papers in the South opposed the Union[68]. Of curious interest it is to learn that the American Bible Society "did not confine its work to the Union troops, but grants were made all through the war to the Southern armies[69]."

This entire situation was not typical merely of the Christian churches. An investigation of the Jewish periodical press during the war shows how the Jews in the North supported the cause of the Union, while the Jews in the South were devoted to the Confederacy[70].

With this, the history of the influences of war and religion, as they affected our Immediate Ancestors, more particularly the Christian and Mohammedan groups, is brought to a close. While traditional thinking makes the stretch from the earliest times of the Egyptians down to the threshold of the present day seem a long one, yet these five or six thousand years that have elapsed are very short when compared to the tens of thousands of years which marked the progress of sociocracy among our Remote Ancestors. While various factors such as climate, geography, or the general environmental conditions, more or less related to these physical elements, have been shown to modify religious beliefs, accounting thereby to an extent, for the diversity that exists, one constant among all such variables is found in the attitude which religions in all times and

all climes have assumed to war. In Africa, Asia, Australia as well as in Europe and America, religion has followed the lead of the "batons de commandement;" and has found in the policy of the government under which it lived, no matter what that policy was, the way in which the power it recognized in the universe could be invoked, to bless with success the weapons used for the defense of the public cause. War then is primary. Religion is essentially bound up with and is secondary to it. And the connection is a thoroughgoing one.

It remains to consult contemporaries, more especially as all seem to agree that at the present writing the world has been plunged into the "World War," in which practically all the nations of all the continents on the globe are engaged. In this stupendous role that war is playing, it must be of supreme value to find out what the attitude of the religionist is. It had been planned to do this very directly by asking as large a number of ministers and representative laymen of all denominations to state in the name of science, if not also of religion, in what way they thought war and religion could or should be related. It may be of value for this work to state that the writer was dissuaded from sending out the questionnaire he had planned by reasons of expediency. It was felt that not only would it be a waste of money and effort because so very few replies would be received, but it was urged by most well-meaning friends that such a procedure would be highly liable to misconstruction as being unpatriotic. Whatever the sentiments, the writer was made to feel that it was the part of prudence not to do this; and this, coupled with material considerations, accomplished the defeat of the plan.

It might be argued now as it was then, that there is ample testimony of the present attitude to war and religion in the daily press of all countries as well as in the religious papers, not to mention the endless stream of books published in all lands from leaders in the churches as well as in politics, art, science, and philosophy. But as the writer sees it, a very unique piece of testimony would have been afforded future generations in thus securing the directly individual reaction of the religionist to war, as well as the collective reaction which, after all, characterizes all the other printed word. It was intended for instance to ask the faculties of all theological seminaries, which represent the scholarship and essential spirituality of each church, how they would phrase the stand of that church in approval or disapproval of war, and how impart that theology to their students. Similarly, conferences of ministers would consciously explain how they interpret the tenets of their faith to fit into the events of the day. The present holds most sacred the beliefs and teachings of the past and uses them for help in the present. Would it not be a precious heritage if the present generation had before it the mass of individual views of groups of clergymen of each faith telling consciously and conscientiously how they worked out a theory of life and belief when the question of war confronted them? It might be objected that the mass of material would be overwhelming; but authorized digests could be made from time to time. This, at least, is the procedure in the matter of the legal relations of individuals to each other; certainly of equal importance should be considered the feeling of faith and trust which a religious guide of men holds to the mystery of mysteries. Even the most out-and-out

agnostic should see the value of such spiritual decisions for the science of religion; and the devout religionist would have the carefully, maturely elaborated ideas of his teachers before him. Suppose for instance there had been handed down from the time when Constantine elevated the Church to authority definite, vouched-for statistics of the number of churches in his day, the number of congregants, the decisions of the individual churches and pastors and bishops on questions of polity; or suppose that such particularistic information were available even from the time of the Reformation; a most definite and exact science of religion would not only be created equal in rank to any other science, but a consciousness of behavior would be so sharpened, that the many exasperating generalizations about "crowd psychology" and "laws of imitation" would not permit the laissez-faire shrug of the shoulders that meets one in places high and low when questions of moment are raised. Religion itself would gain in dignity and worth. Perhaps a great deal of the strength of the Catholic Church lies just in this that there is a recognized code of religious law providing precedents whose binding force is not blind authority but the seal of a history that can be followed in its sequences for hundreds of years. The rejoinder is expected that this may also be its greatest source of weakness. But it cannot be if survival be the test.

At all events, when critical situations arise, the first impulse, and a sort of genuine one, is to find out what some one else did in the present or past to meet such a situation. The record, for example, as it stands now shows that all of the initiative belongs to war; and in a bit of anarchistic fashion, religion has always rushed in pellmell after war was declared, adopted the slogan that the public authorities set; and after floundering through the war, started to limp into recognition during years of peace: but with little success, for it had discredited itself in not speaking boldly in the name of the all-supreme power or mystery to which it declared its only allegiance. The majority of men, if not all men, are religious; they must assume some attitude to mystery; there is no dictum more scientific than that man must live by faith. Some choose to call it "a theory of life;" but that does not make it any the less blind, even as faith is blind. Pitt-Rivers, as noted before, boldly declared his faith in a Providence that has made this world so, that one of the necessities of life is warfare. Practically all nations prove the truth of this, for they all strain and strive to be armed to the teeth; but all the while religion weakly talks about peace and the Church's mission of peace. Religion is then not merely unscientific but it is untrue; and as one of the principal tests in life is survival, religion shows the lack of staying qualities, not because it is not intrinsically valuable, but because of this seeming lack of fiber in those who would and should uphold it. Religion survives despite the flabbiness of its rightful defenders. Instead of a scientist as Pitt-Rivers voicing the unabashed faith in a Power that has made the world to be what we actually find it to be, the churchmen who follow always in the wake of war should make such frank declarations. Instead of that are found the halting, isolated, complicated statements that will be cited soon in the next chapter dealing with contemporaries. Such a study as Leuba made in his "The Belief in God and Immortality" in

which are such definite, absolute statements as ". . disbelief in a personal God and in personal immortality is directly proportional to abilities making for success in the sciences in question" is a tremendously valuable formula for the sciences of Religion, Sociology, Psychology, and, no doubt, others; and as it is based on straightforward evidence of the highest character, it must stand until nullified or disproved by evidence that will be put in the same kind of balances and be found not wanting. Leuba's procedure could be followed in this matter of a questionnaire to ministers and prominent laymen who are devoutly faithful to religion; the evidence could be summarized; and the world for all time could have the benefit of such statements of faith worked out with the most pious care. It is imperative that these "confessions of faith" be made in the stress of war as well as in peace, so that the reactions of men be studied under both conditions, for thereby human knowledge would be greatly enriched and human faith would find its true place in the world—unless that place must inevitably be that which it always has been, that which the next chapter also will show it still to be, utterly secondary to war, though speciously in these days the champion of peace.

If this volume should circulate into broad daylight and at the same time the world struggle still be going on, it would be ever so helpful if all who may read these words would at once express their thoughts on war and religion, and some recognized scientific or religious agency collect and sift them and give the world in a concise and clear form, the results. To say that one cannot be categorical in such matters is but begging the question in the light of the role that religion has played in the past. The mystery of mysteries is as unsolved today as it was in that dawn age of man when some of our Remote Ancestors took particular pains to inhume the dead bodies of particular persons and deposit with them utensils and weapons of war. Man is not master of his fate but he can show some awareness of it and express it for the benefit of future generations, even as the past did much that makes the present rich. Religion should not let its birthright be taken from it by the loyal, devoted sons of clay and clod, of microscope and telescope. It should learn all that these truly pious men of science have wrested from mystery; and should then march boldly into the terra incognita and come back to man with the message that a thousand years in the sight of the Supreme are but as yesterday; that all that has been discovered is vanity compared to all that is undiscovered; and that the undiscoverable, the mystery at the heart of things has a message—be it war, be it peace; and "still small voice" though it be, it should be rightly more availing than all the complicated machinery of human invention which stops so far short of the impenetrable veil. But "to the testimony" of Contemporaries, incomplete and chaotic as it is, and as sequential of the attitude of our Immediate Ancestors, as was that of our Remote Ancestors, to war and religion.

IV. War and Religion Among Contemporaries

Introduction

It is extremely difficult to handle the mighty mass of written material dealing with war and religion that has appeared recently, more especially since the so-called world-war broke out in 1914. To condense a small but representative part of it to such proportions that it will fit into the compass of these pages, brings one to set up somewhat arbitrary rubrics; and in machine-magnet fashion draw out of certain works opinions and beliefs that would naturally cluster about these rubrics, and place them here in orderly manner. While this is unsatisfactory, yet the sustained endeavor not to wrest passages from their context to belie it, but rather to give the gist of the whole thought and illustrate it with an apt quotation, will continue to be the guiding principle. Under such headings then as Christ, Religious Claims in General, Germany Christian or Unchristian, Tolstoy, Old Testament and New Testament, the Pope, Chaplains, Mohammedanism or Turkey, Quakers, typical points of view will be gathered from the vast host of present-day writers. More than ever, the guiding spirit in this eclectic work will be that which it is hoped has directed noticeably the efforts in the preceding chapters—to call to the witness stand men of eminence, who, at the same time, are characterized by a friendly if not personal interest in the religion or theory treated.

In this connection it may be said that it was felt to be part of this endeavor to be fair as well as frank, to include only the names of such contemporaries who had embodied their views in a publication that promised to be of permanent value; whereas those men living whose views are of present value because of their popularity as orators or preachers, would be cited but without disclosing their names. In every case the reference will be given so that the scientific value of this record be not impaired; to have been more specific would have made this study bear some taint of controversialism, whereas its whole, sole aim and object is to eliminate the subjective, and in utterly detached and dispassionate manner give the record of humanity in war and religion as the student in the laboratory conscientiously observes and writes of the reactions of chemicals or organisms when subjected to experimental analysis. Quotations from the daily secular press and from the religious papers and periodicals will also be made without identifying the authors other than to mention the particular denomination professed by the writer, and the title, if any, of the office held.

Part A—Christ

If it is possible to strike off an estimate of Christ that will represent the average opinion of today, it might be expressed as a longing for the Messianic conception of peace, characterized by a righteousness won by peaceful methods if possible, but by warlike measures and by the gage of battle, under the compulsion of circumstances. Of course there are extreme views. Thus Russell unequivocally speaks of "the teaching of

Christ, which admirable as it is, remains quite inadequate for many of the social and spiritual issues of modern life. Art and intellect and all social problems of government are ignored in the Gospels[1]." It is interesting to juxtapose to this the following words of Jevons: "But of all the great religions of the world it is the Christian Church alone which is so far heir of all the ages as to fulfill the dumb, dim expectation of mankind; in it alone the sacramental meal commemorates by ordinance of its founder the divine sacrifice which is a propitiation for the sins of all mankind[2]."

Turning to that larger company of men whose views show reasonableness and intelligence, there may be cited first the earnest champion of a "peace Christ" in W. E. Wilson's "Christ and War" a revised edition of which was published in November 1914. In his introduction he posits as the object of the work, first "To state clearly the Christian objections to war," and second, "To show how the Christian position is supported by the economic argument of Norman Angell," and third, "That the whole teaching of Jesus is practical." For him, war is essentially un-Christian[3]. He interprets all the war sentiments uttered by Jesus or connected with Jesus, in a homiletic way, as not meaning literal belligerency. He contends that all these passages "can only be understood in the light of the total impression of all that Jesus Christ said and was[4]." At the same time he finds "something of nobleness and unselfishness in taking up arms to protect some one else,...for the action is nearer to a truly Christian spirit than is that of the individual who protects himself[5]."

The Oxford University Press issued a series of pamphlets on the war called "Papers for War Time." Number fifteen, published in 1915, on "Christianity and Force," contains this sentence: "If we understood Christ's teachings aright, I believe that we should hate war and a good many other things with a more perfect hatred and yet at the same time feel it a Christian duty to support our country whole-heartedly in the present struggle[6]." Number twenty of this same series in 1915 is on "War, This War, and the Sermon on the Mount." The author cannot reconcile war with a Christian civilization, but adds: "Christ came not as a Lawgiver or Sage.....but as Captain of a forlorn hope.....Every follower of Christ must serve on some Crusade. Thus the Sermon on the Mount is not to be read as a set of rules and regulations but as a battle-song..." People have the misconception of the soldier, in regarding him as an executioner. "The soldier is before all things a man who is ready to die for his country; and readiness to die for others is essentially a Christian thing[7]."

F. J. Foakes-Jackson edited a compilation on "The Faith and the War," published in London in 1915. One of the contributors argues for the rightfulness of certain wars. "....Christ and His followers can hardly have regarded war as always and unconditionally sinful[8]." Still another publication, in 1916 on "War and the Fear of God," is sure that the war will bring "a true good if it puts an end to this misinterpretation of Christ, and reminds us that the rudest savage who is knocked in the head fighting the battle of his clan is nearer the kingdom of God than the most refined and cultivated person who lives on sacrifice and makes none[9]." In 1916 appeared "Christianity After the War" with the asser-

tion that "Christ's whole life, character, teaching and self-sacrifice stood for the resistance of evil to the uttermost[10]."

F. R. Barry, who is a Fellow and Lecturer in Theology in Oriel College Oxford had published in London, in 1915, his book on "Religion and the War." His position is: "It is argued in what follows that 'non-resistance' and the "will to Power" do truly meet in Christianity, and that a Pacifist, which is also Christian warfare is indicated by the Cross[11]."

There is ever so much more material in hand; but the above constitutes a fair sample for illustrating the belief in Christ as essentially peace-loving, yet sanctioning war when absolutely necessary to further His Divine Kingdom. While there must be some overlapping in these sections, as for instance the treatment of New Testament exegesis in connection with this first part on Christ, each subdivision will be fairly homogeneous. Thus in the next part on the "Old Testament versus the New Testament," the one idea prevails concerning the sanction which the former lends to brutal warfare and hence its inferiority to the New Testament.

Part B—Old Testament versus New Testament

Wilson, cited before, consults the New Testament only, for the Old is "admittedly imperfect[12]." In the light of this, it is interesting to note this author's history of the early Church, as far as its espousal of peace is concerned. He finds little if any adherence at any time to the "peace-Christ[13]."

A very remarkable collection of opinions is found in A. Baudrillart's "German War and Catholicism" published in Paris in 1915 under the patronage of the Catholic Commission of French Propaganda. One contributor, writing on "Christian Laws of Warfare," insists that Catholic morality is impregnated with good sense, and is "the inveterate enemy of Utopias.....It teaches then that humanity will in its depths always keep the indestructible germ of every war." After quoting New Testament passages, he concludes: "Hence the right of war[14]." Another participant in this collection writes on German Culture and Catholicism, saying: "Sometimes Pan-Germanism goes back to the Old Testament.. .. But Scriptures, and especially the Old Testament, is a product of the Judaic civilization.....Although Luther is the type of the German Man, of the Kerndeutsche Man, Luther's Christ remains a Jew[15];...."

A British publication on "The National Crisis and Why the Churches Fail" (London 1915) finds that "The last cause of failure which it may be well to notice is that the average Churchman is at heart and in spirit, as to his religion, a Jew. He represents an arrested development[16]." Another British publication avers that the nauseating and repulsive religion of Germany sprang "from the misuse of the Bible by the Kaiser and his underlings.....Thus it identifies Christianity with Judaism, and seeks to bind upon the Christian conscience the ideals and commands of the Old Testament[17]." The Archdeacon of Ely, in his "Christianity and Politics" also points out the defective polity and morality of the Old Testament as contrasted with the New[18]. This same volume contains an official statement on the history of the relations between the Church and War[19] which finds that at first war was tolerated as inevitable in an

evil world. Then from the fifth to the seventeenth century war was consecrated as a part of the Christian polity. Latterly, war is recognized, as an evil; but it is essential "for the preservation of national life[20]." The digression is included, as in the case of Wilson at the beginning of this section, as a curious side-light on the position taken on the Old Testament versus the New. The Old is objected to, presumably, because it puts the God of Battle to the fore; nevertheless the sentiments expressed in the preceding section on Christ, as well as many in this, only qualify but do not deny the compatibility of war and religion. This is made most clear in turning to religion in Germany.

Part C—Germany Christian and Un-Christian

The passing notices in some of the preceding citations to the religious beliefs of Germany could be multiplied myriadfold in this section if space permitted. Perhaps few things have become more notorious in the lands warring against Germany than the belief of the Germans that God is altogether on their side; and the utterances of the Kaiser as reported so very frequently in the daily press are held up to ridicule and generally regarded as basest blasphemy. Thus the latest one to hand at this writing is parodied in a representative metropolitan newspaper in heavy headlines as: "Kaiser Admits God to Full Alliance." The words Emperor William is said to have uttered are: "We do not know what is still in store for us, but you have seen how in this last of the four years of war God's hand has visibly prevailed, punished treachery and rewarded heroic persistence. From this we can gain firm confidence that the Lord will be with us in the future also. If the enemy does not want peace then we must bring peace to the world by battering in with the iron fist and shining sword the doors of those who will not have peace[21]."

So infamous has Germany come to be regarded on account of this attitude to war and religion, that one takes it for granted that it is so. Because of this it may seem vain to devote any space to such a generally admitted condition. But the very fact that volumes and libraries could be filled with this particular subject alone makes it necessary to give adequate notice to this phenomenon here because it is such a perfect, even if extreme illustration, of the truth herein to be established.

Again for the sake of proportion, only a very few can be noted here of the hundreds and thousands of writers who dwell on this matter of Christian or un-Christian Germany; and men of the highest caliber will be selected for these few representatives. By way of emphasis as well as for purposes of harmonious presentation, Bernhardi who has been selected to give the German viewpoint will be reserved for a section by himself, immediately succeeding that devoted to Tolstoy, so that each may serve as a foil to the other.

An article in "The Churchman" (London 1914) on "German Christianity and the Great War" would prove that Eucken is not Christian despite his learned assertions. The Germans offer to the world the tiger in man instead of the strength of Christ[22].

The utterances of Gilbert Murray must command attention not only because of his well-merited fame, but for the remarkable contrast his

words present to the gentle, poetic manner and style of this man whose spare form is aglow with spirituality when he recites with fervor and enthusiasm selections from the immortal dramatists of classic Greece. He has written much on the war, in a tone naturally exalted and generally noble, but none the less firm and intensely patriotic. He contributes a paper on "Ethical Problems of the War" in a volume edited by J. E. Carpenter, containing "fourteen addresses by leading British men," all on the theme "Ethical and Religious Problems of the War" published in London in 1916.

Murray says that the war appealed to him first as an ethical problem. He has not the least doubt "in any corner of" his mind but that the war was right. He thinks that the break-up of the Empire would be a great disaster for the world. But greater than all other evils it would be to submit to Germany because that land represents the rule of naked force. In a book from Murray's pen published a few months ago, on "Faith, War and Policy," he regards Germany as a "nation of lost souls[24]." In 1914, when the war-storm burst, he found himself completely changed from an ardent peace-lover to a man "resolute to face death and to kill." He was sorry each day when reports in the press announced fewer Germans slain than the day before. Yet he does not hate the Germans but their "Prussian blood-and-iron ambition, their strange culture.....that idol of blood and clay and true gold[25 26]."

Another leading Briton included in Carpenter's collection regards the conflict as a "battle between God and the Devil." He is persuaded that the world will "exorcise the demon" that Germany is[27].

There are many more men of light and leading who could and should be cited here on the un-Christian religion of Germany. A glance through the Oxford Pamphlets, more especially those dealing with war and religion would reveal much useful material. Some of the pamphlets are written by such men as the Bishop of Lincoln, and the Dean of Christ Church, Oxford. An exceptional offering is from the Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford, who in his "The War and Theology" finds some Christianity in Germany, and who insists more on the thought of utilizing Germany as a solemn warning to England rather than inveighing against the enemy[28].

This leniency in judgment, however, is submerged in the torrents of hate that course through "The War and Religion," by Alfred Loisy, translated from the French and vehemently prefaced by A. Galton, published at Oxford, England in 1915. One is led to believe that M. Loisy, of the College de France, is offering a scientific, dispassionate study of war and religion[29]. Instead of this, one finds himself wading through the turbulent, boiling stream of perfervid patriotism, led on by the oriflamme: "the salvation of France. Here is our common religion: one which has no unbelievers[30]." The preface denounces the "innate bestiality of the Germanic nature.....The Prussians are uncivilized, and uncivilizable; and the Allies should deal with them accordingly[31]." Loisy is also bitter against the German "beast of prey[32]." But he divides his surging passion between inveterate hate against the Papal institution and exaltation of devotion to one's country. He maintains that "the religion which is most alive, which for a great number of people is the only living one, is not the Christian faith, but devotion to one's country[33]."

Such impassioned sentiments may well serve to turn this current of thought on "Germany Christian or un-Christian" to a most brief consideration of two meaty volumes published in 1917 that aim to, and in general, do give an impartial and fair review of German war thought, especially along religious lines. One bears the strange title "Hurrah and Hallelujah." The author, J. P. Bang, a Dane, offers this explanation of it: "The new German spirit has found one of its most classical expressions in a collection of poems published by a German pastor, Konsistorialrat Dietrich Vorwerk, under the significant title, Hurrah and Hallelujah. I find in this combination something so absolutely characteristic of the German spirit, that I have adopted it as the title of this book. In the first edition of Pastor Vorwerk's book there occurred a paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer, of which I will cite the last three petitions and the close:

"Though the warrior's bread be scanty, do Thou work daily death and tenfold woe unto the enemy. Forgive in merciful long-suffering each bullet and each blow which misses its mark, etc., etc.[34] [35]" But the Germans thought this was blasphemous and it did not appear in later editions of the book[36]. Nevertheless the sermons of the German preachers that fill the collection by Bang show merely a change in letter and not in spirit. There are whole series of preachments on "The German God." And the assertion is wearyingly made that "the nature of Germanism is one with the nature of Christianity[37] [38]." Bang disclaims any intention of drawing up a case against German religiosity. He has gathered the average religious beliefs of the German pastors. He cannot but conclude that "arrogance, self-righteousness, the blindest Pharisaism, and the bitterest hatred, characterize a great number of German sermons at the present time[39]." To prove that he aims to be fair, he includes the more elevated thoughts of a few representative Germans. But their voices are lost in the large chorus of hate[40].

The second collection entitled: "Gems(?) of German Thought" made by a representative Englishman, W. Archer, includes quotations from the leading German thinkers and scientists as well as from the religionists. The author doubts "whether the literature of the world can show a parallel to the amazing outburst of tribal arrogance, unrestrained and unashamed, of which these pages contain but a few scattered specimens." He says that "many of the wildest shrieks of self-glorification and ferocity proceed from clerics and theologians[41]." Archer lays much stress on "the living influence of Nietzsche" whose "Zarathustra" along with "Faust and the New Testament were found, upon German investigation, to be the books most in demand among the soldiers[42]." Then follow long series of quotations from Haeckel, Harnack, Bernhardi, Nietzsche, finding their climax in Nietzsche's famous words: "Ye say it is the good cause which halloweth even war? I say unto you, it is the good war which halloweth every cause." "Ye shall love peace as a means to new wars—and the short peace more than the long[43] [44] [45] [46] [47]."

Finally, a word should be quoted from the address by the renowned F. Delitzsch, delivered in Berlin in 1914, on the subject: "Psalmenworte für die Gegenwart," because it is so reminiscent of Vorwerk's paraphrase on the Lord's Prayer. His text is Psalm 121. In closing, he quotes the Psalm and paraphrases the last verse thus: "Der Herr behüte unsern

Ausgang und Eingang in das neue Kriegsjahr und sei mit Deutschland von nun bis in Ewigkeit!" Amen[48]!

From this bottomless welter of opinion there is one thing that clearly emerges. To the average non-German there is no people so un-Christian, so befogged with the traditions of the old tribal religion as is the German folk; and conversely, to the Germans, no nation has the exalted religious consciousness of Christianity that inheres in themselves. From both of these contentions one thing is most sure. Religion is playing no small part in helping the rulers to carry out their plans, thus showing that in this latest day, religion is still essentially connected with war, and in a secondary capacity. And as this tale has now been brought to the very present moment, this connection between war and religion must be thoroughgoing.

Part D—Religious Claims in General

If only partial justice were to be done to this rubric, one would have to edit a series of volumes not dissimilar to the book by Sweet on the "Methodist Episcopal Church in the Civil War" that was used in connection with the preceding chapter; and the effort to make it completely scientific would involve the expenditure of too much labor in order to bring out the very same class of material and conclusions that Sweet gathered in his volume. For all the leading churches of all denominations; all the leading church publications; all the popular clergymen of every faith with but two exceptions; all the influential laymen interested in Church work; all the rulers of all the countries possibly excepting France; all the congregations without exception, have asked the blessing of God on their efforts to crush the enemy or to gain the victory. A great deal of evidence is at hand; but in the light of all the preceding attention given to Contemporaries and because of the projected study of Bernhardi, the Quakers, Tolstoy, and a hasty consideration of theories of progress, it ought not to be regarded as essential here to burden this lengthy account of war and religion with this superabundant material.

It should be sufficient to say that the gamut of religious expression today runs from such a public utterance made before a responsible American audience by a minister, to the effect, that if he had his way, every bullet that was fired at the Germans should have upon it the sign of the Cross (the address was quoted in a conservative, careful newspaper of a very large circulation and was delivered a year before the United States entered the war); and in gradation from this run hundreds of examples of the words of popular preachers occupying the most prominent pulpits among all the Christian denominations, as well as among the Jewish, who had been outspoken pacifists, believing that the message of religion was that of peace. But when the President of the United States sent his war message to the Congress, all of them supported his program with the exception of two men who are leaders in the Unitarian Church which embraces, comparatively, but a handful of followers, and which as a church group in convention formally endorsed the war-policy of the nation as did the conferences and meetings of all other church bodies. Of the groups that spoke very eloquently for the idea of the peace interpretation of the Godhead, none seemed to surpass, in pre-war

ays the Rabbis of Reform Judaism, under whom the writer of this study as educated. Their preachments were built fundamentally, if not holly, on the words of the great Prophets of Israel; and the Reform wish ministry regarded it as its special prerogative to enunciate and vivify the prophetic doctrines which they summed up in the words: Ethical Monotheism," a religion of righteousness and peace. Many them were most fond of quoting as their motto: "Israel's mission is eace." There seemed much of the Quaker spirit in their words, that laid ch emphasis on this idea of deity and a mission of peace. But though few declaimed against the preparedness campaign that swept the untry during the months preceding its entry into the war, most of em supported it whole-heartedly. And finally, when war was requested the Congress, not one remained to champion this peace religion that as read from the Prophets; but on the contrary, one or two of the most rominent pulpiteers who were most fervent interpreters of the Prophetic aith have now become equally earnest in their support of the war. The xpression used most widely by all religionists in pulpit and pew, and in ll denominations, is that this is a righteous or holy war; and that God esires those who believe in Him to lay down their lives, if necessary, for ich a blessed cause as the nation is struggling to uphold.

The President of the United States used as his closing words to the essage he sent to the Congress, asking that war be declared against ermany, the sentence: "God helping her, she can do no other[49]." Two eeks after the declaration of war, the President issued a special message o the country at large asking for the entire co-operation of all the people or the successful prosecution of the war. His opening words were: My Fellow-Countrymen: The entrance of our own beloved country nto the grim and terrible war for democracy and human rights which has haken the world, creates so many problems of national life and action hich call for immediate consideration and settlement, that I hope you ill permit me to address to you a few words of earnest counsel and ppeal with regard to them." Then follow particular expressions of ppeal to employers and employed of all kinds. The last words are ddressed specifically to clergymen in this wise: "And I hope that clergy- en will not think the theme of it an unworthy or inappropriate subject comment and homily from their pulpits. The supreme test of the ution has come. We must all speak, act, and serve together." (Signed) Woodrow Wilson[50]."

The following telegrams were exchanged on December 25, 1917, by overnment officials:

"Please extend to the President and the Secretary of War holiday eetings and best wishes for the success of our arms during the coming ear, and convey them from all ranks of the American Expeditionary orces in France renewed pledge of devotion to our sacred cause. Like- ise extend our greetings to our comrades at home, coupled with full onfidence in patience, courage and devotion to the flag." (Signed) Pershing."

The War Department made public the following reply to this Christ- as greeting from General Pershing, by General Bliss, Chief of Staff: "The President and Secretary of War send to you and to the American

Army in France the most cordial greeting and good wishes for [illegible] Christmas season from the people of the United States. Your comra[illegible] in arms in every camp and cantonment send you greetings. From e[illegible] home today goes a prayer for the welfare and success of our troop[illegible] France, and personally for that of every man of them. The nation rep[illegible] in you and them its full confidence that in God's good time and [illegible] God's blessing, its troops in France, side by side with their gallant al[illegible] will bring victory and abiding peace to all the world." "Bliss[51]."

In view of such an utterly unmanageable mass of material all of w[illegible] resolves itself into the attitude to war and religion that has been fo[illegible] unexceptionally the same from the Remote Past up to the presen[illegible], it was thought that this part devoted to "Religious Claims in Gene[illegible]ral" would be most worth while if but three or four of the leading thinke[illegible]rs of today, who felt the cause of religion sincerely and deeply, were consu[illegible]lted now.

The stage which the thinking of Gilbert Murray reached this year has been spoken of before. As in the case of everything that has gone before, the man's words will be given without any opinion expressed on them. This book, be it again said, is concerned almost entirely with the presentation of facts that bear on humanity's reactions to war and religion, and in this volume the historical evidence alone is to be submitted. The study must be continued into the realms of psychology and biology before a judgment or opinion that is thorough, can be formed. In this spirit, therefore, Murray's attitude is given as a fact of contemporaneous reaction to war and religion.

He says: "We are driven back to a sort of mysticism. Mankind knows that suffering itself is evil, but the wish to cause suffering is incalculably and disproportionately worse. All the cruel deeds, all the killing and maiming that are done day by day, night by night, over most of Europe, are not the real will, not the real free actions of any man. It is all a thing that has happened. Who among men ever wished for this war? We know that our own statesmen strained every nerve to prevent it. The soldiers fighting never wished it. No one wished it. Not the great criminals and semi-maniacs in Germany and Austria who brought it about; not even they wished for this. What they wished was wicked enough, Heaven help them; when they dreamed of their triumphal march on Paris and the rest of the frischer fröhlicher Krieg, the "fresh and joyous war." But they never wished for this that has come. They thought it would be quite different. They are staring aghast, like Frankenstein, at the monster they have created.

"But it makes some difference in one's ultimate judgment, it saves one from a wild reaction against all organized human society as an accursed thing, if we realize that the war is not really the work of man's will. It is more a calamity to pity than a crime to curse[52]."

An equally striking confession is contained in Hastings Rashdall's discussion of the "Problem of Evil." The conclusion of it is: "On our view there are no forces of evil in the world except the forces which God has caused and continues to cause; and God would not have caused them at all unless He had been conscious of the power to overcome them sufficiently to produce a balance of good on the whole. This much we

may assert confidently..... Why all this evil should be necessary as the means to an ultimate good on the whole.....these are questions which we can never answer[53]."

This discussion is found in the compilation of Foakes-Jackson referred to before. The compiler states in the preface that all the contributors are at one in the belief that the Christian Church has not yet risen to the occasion, but that this fiery trial will purify it. All agree also on the justice of England's cause. Further, the volume is characterized by "a conspicuous absence of impractical suggestions as to what should be done under circumstances which may never arise[55]."

A reference, if only a passing one, must be made to the bulky publications of the "Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America." Much of this material breathed a lofty spirit, in pre-war days, of reconciliation and peace among the nations[56]. But when the country entered the war, the Council called a special meeting in which resolutions were passed, consecrating the churches with "their resources of courage, of sacrifice, of service, of prayer, to the uses of the nation as it steadies itself for the travail and triumph of war[57]." The entire proceedings of this special meeting were published under the title: "The Churches of Christ in Time of War" in "the hope that they may serve pastors, teachers, and churches in adjusting their service to the call of the hour[58]."

More or less similar testimony is afforded by another publication of this Federal Council. It is "The Fight for Peace," by S. L. Gulick, (New York 1915) who is laboring so earnestly for a better understanding between Japan and America. The book begins with a prayer by Rauschenbusch in which occur the words: "Bless our soldiers and sailors for their swift obedience.....May our young men still rejoice to die for their country[59]..."

As it is feared that this section is already too extended, it was thought best to limit the remainder of it to the Quakers, Bernhardi and Tolstoy, and to a word on Progress, instead of adding the other captions of Turkey and Christianity which after all would mean repetition of the material on Immediate Ancestors:—a fitful flaming up of the century-old struggle between the men of the southern and northern grasslands; the topic "Chaplains" need not be expatiated upon in view of what was said regarding Sweet's book and the all-too-short notice of the activities of the Federal Churches of Christ; the Pope and the Papacy ought to be treated at length for its constituency runs into the millions as does that of the Federal Churches, and because of the Pope's efforts to bring about peace. But the latter has created such a confusion of opinion that it is best to say no more concerning it at the present time. The general viewpoint of the Church of Rome may best be summarized in the Christmas message which the Pope sent the American people on December 24, 1917, through the Associated Press, a most reliable news gathering organization; and in addition the Christmas message at the same time of Cardinal Gibbons. The Pope's words are:

"The Holy Father sends to the people of America his cordial greetings and prays that they may take to heart, in this time of strife and suffering, the true lesson of Christmastide—the lesson of God's unceasing love for mankind; the lessons of unfaltering courage and sacrifice of self.

"More especially he calls upon the little children to whom this day belongs, to pray with all their hearts to the Babe of Bethlehem that He may protect their loved ones and give back to the world that peace which He came to bring upon earth[60]."

The message of Cardinal Gibbons is as follows:

"To all the soldiers and sailors in the service of the United States: The message of Christmas is that of obedience. The Christ Child whom all Christendom loves and admires came into the world of His own making to fulfill the will of His Heavenly Father. If that Christ Child should come into the world today He would say:

" 'In the head of the Book it is written that I should do Thy will. Behold I come.'

"Before the infant Saviour opened His mouth, He taught in His human form the wonderful lesson of obedience. In sending to all of you my very best wishes for a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year, I entreat you to learn this lesson of the Divine Infant, obedience to the will of your superiors[61]."

Part E—The Quakers

It is possible that at times the reader of these pages felt within him a rankling resentment against what appeared as a one-sided view of the role of religion as essentially bound up with war, as its slavish abettor and aid; and this objector desired to raise the question more than once: "What of the Quakers?"

It must be admitted that the answer to this question cannot be as decided and clear as all that which has gone before. First, the Quakers are lost, numerically speaking, in the general population. Then their earliest traditions and history do not center about an anti-war attitude at all. Further, while their faith in peace naturally brought them later to clash with the public authorities whenever war supervened, they themselves were divided on the question of the righteousness of a war of defence or of offence. There are two points to be considered which savor of hairsplitting but only because the Quakers are numerically, as stated before, a negligible minimum. The first point is reflected in such criticism as is most generally directed against all anti-war advocates and may be found in Galton's preface to Loisy's book spoken of before. He says: "The survival of the Quakers was only possible because they have always been an insignificant minority, that has owed its protection solely to the maintenance by others of the very principles which itself repudiates and declines to share. A leading Quaker is reported to have said recently: "Trust in God, and damn the consequences." Most assuredly, the consequences of not resisting Germany would be damnable.

"Though the Quakers declined military service and deprecated force, they have always enjoyed the full protection of soldiers and police. It is incredible that Jesus anticipated or would countenance such a dishonest solution of his problem[62]." Cunningham is a trifle more generous in his judgment of them. In his "Christianity and Politics" he thinks there is much in the New Testament to justify their attitude to war, but he thinks they are too particularistic in their theology and "they condemned the attitude which had been taken by Christian men towards

war in all previous ages." Later in his book, he again affirms "There can be no doubt that much plausible argument can be adduced in favor of their position from the New Testament" but "they were not consistently following the example of the Early Christians, as they had no scruple in securing their rights by litigation, and had no rules to enable them to refrain from hard bargains in business[63]."

A strictly fair interpretation of the facts of the case must show that these recriminations against the Society of Friends as such are unfair and untrue. Individuals may err, but in the large the faithful followers of Fox or better, as they might wish to put it, of the "Inner Light," have an enviable record in living up to the ideals that are generally considered praiseworthy.

The much more difficult question, the one of direct concern to this study, is the "war" activities of such official groups among the Quakers in England and America as may be conveniently designated as "Reconstruction Units," "Ambulance Corps," and much of what is known today as "Red Cross Activities." It may be a matter of quibbling to decide whether such endeavors during war times may be construed as a sanction, by this religious sect, of the prosecution of the war by the Government. The principal argument pro is that such works of mercy must be done by the sincere believer in Jesus whether it be in time of war or peace; the principal thing is to abstain from joining in battle. On the other hand, Quakers themselves contend that abstention from even such works of love and mercy mean the absolute non-recognition of warfare, the bringing of the battling sooner to an end. For if the Friends did not do such works of kindness and reconstruction, the combatants would have to devote some of their energies to these, instead of releasing all of the population for the feverish pursuit of manufacturing the implements of war, and the actual filling of the ranks by such men, who would otherwise be compelled to perform these "peace" duties. Some student of ethics in the far distant future may be able, dispassionately, to decide the merits of this query. But on the face of it, there can be no gainsaying that such helpful activities give "aid and comfort" to the Governments enjoying such valuable assistance freely and abundantly rendered. The witness they bear against war is a passive and indirect one; not an active and aggressive one such as Fox and his disciples bore against "hat wearing," and the theological spinnings of the preachers of the day, against the "steeple-houses," fashionable dress, and shams in general.

In truth there is nothing in earliest Quaker traditions that would mean the development of such an utterly intolerant position against war. Braithwaite's study on "The Beginnings of Quakerism" expressly states that it was against carousing in drink, through the custom of treating, that started Fox on his religious career; and there is next to nothing in his whole life and thought to suggest that he was most exercised against warfare. He wanted men to dwell on the life of Jesus and not theorize on the death and resurrection. It was the life of simplicity, sincerity, humility, meekness and returning good for evil, and not doctrinal disputes and wranglings over dogmas, that made the Inner Light by which Jesus guided men to the Father. They were so zealous against ceremonial and priestcraft and a paid ministry that they grew virulent and

shockingly intolerant in their pamphleteering, though no less so than was considered usual in those days. As far as the beginnings of Quakerism are concerned there is no overwhelming evidence of anti-war propaganda; on the contrary, there is some indirect, important testimony favoring war[64] [65]. This is all the more surprising because Quakerism owed so much to sectaries of the Anabaptist character. And these, as noted before, had adopted the anti-war dogma as one of their principal tenets. Yet Fox seems to have been influenced more by the deep earnestness and simple spirituality of these men than by any specific anti-war doctrine.

Quakerism never gained a large following. It may be fair to say that each period of warfare it passed through left it always weaker numerically. In his "The Quakers in the American Colonies," R. M. Jones notes the division created among them by the American Revolution[66]. In the American Civil War it is stated that they enlisted in greater proportion to their numbers than any other denomination. In the present world-war, the Friends have not only officially approved of the works of mercy in connection with the struggle, but communications have appeared not infrequently in the daily press giving their views for and against the duties of Friends in the matter of actual service as soldiers. Their very central doctrine of being guided by the "Inner Light" makes the arguments of both sides legitimate and right[67] [68] [69] [70].

In dealing with such a noble group of sincere religionists as the Quakers have shown themselves to be, one is made most anxious not to be unfair in passing judgment. At best then it may be agreed that their record in history is an uncertain one. War at all events has had a most profound influence on them. They have had no influence on war. To a degree, therefore, they help to establish the thesis of this study. And further, they help to make intelligible the life and thinking of the only prominent Occidental who fearlessly turned from a military life to what is termed the most extreme commentary on the life and teachings of Jesus. This unique distinction accrues to the Russian, Leo N. Tolstoy.

Part F—Tolstoy

Tolstoy's writings reveal an anguished spirit in search for God, finding itself baffled by a ritualistic, dogmatic church. This church found, as its chief reason for existence, a whole-hearted support of a militaristic government. Tolstoy bluntly asserts that "the church is the worst enemy of Christianity[71]." He says that he was repelled from the church by the strangeness of its dogmas, its approval of persecutions, capital punishment and wars. For Christianity is nothing if it means not love for men. "To say that we must offer our cheek and love our enemy is to express the essence of Christianity[72]."

Tolstoy denounces fiercely those who deliberately twist the words and commands of Jesus to mean the very opposite of what they say. He himself, however, is hard put to it to give a peace interpretation to the New Testament's seeming approval of war. For instance, to explain why there is no clear-cut statement against war, he states that "Christ could not have imagined it, and so he could not have forbidden a Christian to wage war. . . . . Nor could one of the apostles, nor one of the disciples of

Christ of the first centuries of Christianity, have imagined that it was necessary to forbid murder, called war." This strikes one as strange as Tolstoy's theory of pain "Because we not only need it, but also could not live if we did not experience pain[73]." This mysticism into which he dips more than once[74] is not an asset of particular value to his thought.

Tolstoy's reading of the Christ life is disputed by nearly all men[75] [76]. And even such a non-religious pacifist as is Russell passes this comment: "Those who, like Tolstoy, endeavor seriously to take the Gospels as a guide to life are compelled to regard the ignorant peasant as the best type of man, and to brush aside politcal questions by an extreme and impractical anarchism[77]." Tolstoy's son, Count Ilya Tolstoy, in contributing articles to the American press on the revolution in Russia gives an intimate glimpse or two of his father. He draws a sharp contrast between the Bolsheviki platform and a true Tolstoyan one. He then insists that while his father was unalterably opposed to war, he was stirred, nevertheless, to the bottom of his soul on reading of the Russian reverses in the Japanese war. When he bade his son Andrei farewell, as he left for the front, he said to him: "You know my views. But I do not condemn you for going to war. If I had been in your place, and had your views of life, I also would have done as you are doing[78]."

Here then is a man, whose name is written large in contemporary annals, standing practically alone as a literal interpreter of the doctrines of complete non-resistance enunciated by Jesus. Nineteen hundred years of Christianity testify against his understanding of these New Testament doctrines. In the entire history of the peoples of the earth, there are but two other men of his caliber with whom he stands: possibly Buddha and Lao-Tse. As for the influence which these spiritual giants and their teachings have exerted on the course of history, is it at all an exaggeration to say that the story of humanity would have been the same, from the standpoint of war and religion, had they never lived and taught their theories of peace and quietism? Religion has always been altogether too much at home with war, as these pages have shown, to admit of any hesitation in answering this question. One of the latest exponents of the usefulness of religion to war that will be considered here is Bernhardi, who is the very antipodes of Tolstoy.

Part G—Bernhardi

General Friederich von Bernhardi, in his "Germany and the Next War," (London 1912) may be regarded as a precipitate of the prevailing German thought of the present day. As most generalizations are apt to be unfair, this is not putting matters in the most liberal light. But if it were possible to strike an average of the highest, the medium and the lowest thinking of that empire, it would appear that Bernhardi's works would almost equal the result. It may be taken for granted that the preceding part on "Germany Christian or un-Christian" can weight this judgment to satisfy individual opinion.

Bernhardi brings classical and German philosophical support for the idea that the dream of perpetual peace is characteristic of a weary, spiritless and exhausted age[79]. He then interprets the teachings of Christ

and of Christianity as fully in accord with the universal law of struggle. "There never was a religion more combative than Christianity." And according to Christianity, "we cannot disapprove of war in itself, but must admit that it is justified morally and historically[80]."

Of course the war of which he speaks does not pursue "unmoral or frivolous aims," but has the highest moral value, for it involves the honor of the nation. He quotes ex-President Roosevelt at length for the support of his contention[82]. That Germany may be fully prepared for this war he urges his nation to eliminate one of its greatest weaknesses: its quarrels over religious differences. He pleads for spiritual unity combined with "absolute liberty of thought[82]." He sees a gigantic struggle ahead of Germany and is greatly solicitous that the house be put in social, moral and religious order. The population must be kept healthy; alcoholism must be fought with every weapon; and real religious instruction must be imparted, for this is of inestimable value, above all, for soldiers. Moral influences of religion should be more prominent than formal contents[83].

Bernhardi thus furnishes a most perfect example to illustrate this study. With him, war is the all-important thing. Religion is essential for the ends of war and hence secondary to it.

It is worth while to pause a moment to include the somewhat analogous position to Bernhardi which H. G. Wells has held in England. There is one important difference, however, that in itself lends greatest emphasis and point to this study. Before the war, Wells conceived it to be his special mission to awaken England to the impending storm. If the British Empire is to survive, it must learn that "War is no longer the crude brawls of the savage but the refined art of the scientist." As for religion, it was apparently of no concern whatsoever to Wells. But after the war had started, Wells more than overtook Bernhardi. Within these three years of the war, he has had published several books in which the thought that is uppermost is a regardfulness of the mystery of mysteries that controls the destinies of men and nations. Surely such a radical change is of most telling import for this thesis[84].

Part H—Summary

To recapitulate these three chapters dealing with "War and Religion in Fact" among our Remote and Immediate Ancestors as well as among our Contemporaries would be a dreary performance. But the main conclusions should be briefly presented.

War and Religion are ordinarily held as opposites. This study must make it evident that they are most essentially connected. This connection reveals war as the primary factor, religion being secondary to war. Such relations between war and religion have been and are thoroughgoing, having existed in this way throughout all history.

This relationship extends from that far distant day when man had struggled to an estate that readily distinguished him from all other creatures, through countless ages, till culture flourished on the Nile and the Euphrates, when it was made abundantly clear that man used religion for the ends of war. In the millennia following this Egyptian stage,

it was fairly proved that where social integration was most intense, and hence fighting most frequent, the mysterious powers surrounding man were regarded in different ways, but always with the hope that victory would be a regular gift for any and all attention bestowed upon these elusive elemental powers. Let what terms be applied to man and the power in the universe that one will—call man civilized, and the power God; speak of man as cultured and his interpretation of mystery as Christian or Mohammedan, the outstanding facts discernible in the past are the same that are undeniably present today. No matter how one feels or thinks about it, the fact is incontestably true that war is and has been the all-engrossing activity of mankind for all time, and religion is and has been but a minor, secondary interest to it, furthering it, blessing it and making for its perpetuation. This is as undeniable as the fact that volcanoes destroy human as readily as any other form of life; and as puzzlingly true as the common observation that all catastrophic events engulf the just and the righteous as well as the unjust and the wicked.

Whether this association of religion with war is a necessary and perpetual one, cannot be predicated on the basis of an historical survey, such as this, alone, But it was thought vain to enter upon the prosecution of the more abstruse psychological and biological implications without having cleared away this readily accessible field of operation. Not indeed that even these latter sciences can enter into this sociological problem with a signed and sealed verdict of eternal validity. In fact, even their findings must be circumscribed by human records; and more than one fork of the road will be encountered, the only help for a decision as to which is the highway, being the greater number of marks of human footsteps on the one than on the other. Such fallible tests have more than once led to a blind alley. At the same time, man does not seem ready to leap into the dark with Gilbert Murray, and with the salve of mysticism cool the smarting bruises and cruel pains caused by dashing against the immovable rock of the supreme will. Man thinks he is responsible for things on this earth. Each group holds the other accountable for the civilization it maintains. And man is ever ready to impeach his fellows for hindering human progress. But if for countless ages one and the same stamp has left indelibly its mark on man, no matter in what time or clime he lived; if in two such deeply searching things as war and religion humanity reveals not the slightest difference from the remotest past up to the burning present, then wherein is there room to speak of progress; and what can the word responsibility mean?

Of course no completely satisfying answer can be given to these hoary questions; and even the small amount of attention to be given them here will be restricted as far as possible rather to the realm of fact than of theory; and in this way linked with the whole study on war and religion. Whatever umbrage may have been taken for permitting such writers as Bernhardi and Wells to speak for Contemporaries, may be dispelled if the previous statement made in connection with them is agreed to, i. e., that they reflect the thinking processes of the average individual of this Occidental world. At the same time, if such opinions and thoughts are to be the criteria of progress, then the only refuge is the confession of helplessness made by Murray. It was for that reason that the matter

was not permitted to rest here but it was deemed proper to append a word on progress that would at the same time give some indication as to the course of evolution some of the best thinkers of today predict in their prognoses on human society. What part will war play, and what religion; and will their relations be the same as they are in the present and have been throughout all the past? If the men cited before were not representative enough, every effort would be made in this closing chapter to gather what is generally conceded to be the best thought of this day. Even in this procedure, of course, one is liable to include a group that would not be convincing enough for some. It is well to repeat, therefore, that the selection was made here with the same principles in mind that dominated all the preceding search for authorities: first and foremost the impartial ends of science devoted to the discovery of truth regardless of consequences, yet at the same time the tempering influence of genuine sympathy for the cause investigated.

Another criticism against this section dealing with Contemporaries may be anticipated in a moment's attention to the possible inquiry as to why such scientifically and scholarly vouched-for living movements as Positivism, Ethical Culture and Spiritualism were not definitely studied as were Tolstoyanism and the Quakers. First of all it may be said that the testimony they would yield would be, in effect, exactly the same as that which marked all religions in their relations to war; then there is more or less of the spirit of the controversial in treating of such movements under the head of religion, though the definition employed in this work readily must define them as such; and finally, at the risk of being misunderstood, it was felt that in a work such as this, devoted to great world movements that have held the populations of the earth in their sway for thousands of years—such limited groups were of too ephemeral a nature to warrant any detailed study here. Needless to say, it is more than granted that their sponsors are men of just renown; and the ideas propagated worthy of most serious attention.

Because the closing chapter will yield much space to that glorious monument of living scholarship, "The Cambridge Modern History;" which with its companion work "The Cambridge Medieval History," has veritably been the backbone of an important part of this study, the promised word regarding its extensive use may as well be spoken here as anywhere else.

For argument sake, at least, it may be agreed, that man shows himself pre-eminently emotional when it comes to discussing issues of war and religion. Because of this, the worth of most historical documents has been vitiated. This was passingly referred to at the beginning of chapter two. The great problem, therefore, in gathering witnesses and testimony for this case of war and religion throughout human history, was to find men of a type, who wrote in such a detached way, that both they and their words would pass universal muster. To corral a large number of individuals and rehearse their own particular interpretations of all nations and peoples of all times would mean confusion in a mass of learning. In a study such as this, that isolated two activities of humanity the danger was ever too imminent of reading things into texts that were already colored by egoistic life-philosophy, and individualistic interpre-

tation of man's story past and present. The Cambridge Histories were designed to eliminate the ego and to present as unbiasedly as possible the fact. The contributors were chosen because they would see events, not through nationalistic glasses, but through the clear air of the untamed mountain tops whence long-distance views could be secured; whence consciousness of state lines and boundaries had been eliminated, and the rivulets and streams and rivers of humanity could be leisurely surveyed and calmly mapped, aside from questions of civilization and of progress.

But in addition to this most valuable method of having specialists treat of the particular period or individual or movement of which they had humbly made a life-study, and the consequent fairness of view which the overlapping of opinions and their occasional clashing afforded, the supremely helpful contribution of these weighty volumes consisted in the fact that the scientific, scholarly Churchmen of England co-operated in spirit and in letter to make the work possible; and this aid meant everything in using the labors of these scholars in such a study as this on war and religion. The average scientist of today does not take religion seriously, as is abundantly proved in the statistical study of Leuba. His interest in it is merely scientific; and it may be his zeal for science that tempts him at times to overshoot the mark and treat the religionist past or present with contempt. But is not the very essence of pure science the elimination of all bias and prejudice, and at the same time the identically regardful attitude to one and all of the facts of life; whether a fact be the belief of an individual, or of a group, in a piece of stone as the source of all the power and well-being of it; or whether a fact be the microscopic germ that is handled with all delicate care and solicitude by the laboratorist? It matters not what the religious belief may be, it is a most precious fact for understanding man's history; and the more detached and scientific the student is, the more will he marvel how the least developed intellect as well as the greatest, turns at times, if not regularly, to the mystery at the heart of things; and from his attitude to it is able to continue as part of the stream of life, supported by his faith in the unknown and unknowable. Here indeed has been presented the millennia-old record of man, battling against his fellow men, as part of his struggle for existence and survival; and the help he continuously or ultimately found to sustain him, to spur him on, to hope for victory, has come from his profession of faith in the blessings that were given his arms by the powers he recognized as controlling affairs. There is no room to speak here of delusions; for if warfare is a reality, equally so is the parallel record of religious faith, of the attitude to mystery, varying in form, but in essence one. Many scientists become impatient with man religious because they have ceased to or never did feel the call of mystery as their fellow men have. A few on the other hand see more in religion than there actually is. It is the unusual combination of the sincere scientist, and either the true religionist or fair appraiser of religious phenomena, that is found in these Cambridge studies in history. When, therefore, the common verdict rendered in its volumes is that war is the primary factor and religion links itself closely to war for the support of the political policies of the ruling group, one feels sure that the judgment is one of truth; and is a generalization that can safely be employed for further research.

Much, then, of the material for a discussion of progress and a glimpse into the future will be based on the twelfth volume of the Cambridge Modern History; and it may be then safe to assert that the proper bearings have been secured to travel from this historical outline of humanity's attitude to war and religion, through the more devious roads of the psychological and biological sciences.

V. Conclusions

The opening chapter of the last, the twelfth, volume of the Cambridge Modern History, which appeared in 1910 (New York) gives that large free view of world-history so characteristic of the entire work. The subjugation by the European powers of the rest of the world which began in the sixteenth century, reaches its apogee at the opening of this twentieth century when only those parts of the earth have escaped European rule through "the establishment of strong and stable governments and by the adoption at any rate of European military arts" and all other agencies "necessary to military efficiency. The whole world is now the sphere of European activity..." "It is idle to censure the inevitable or to pass judgment upon destiny; the European nations have resembled other conquering races in their brutality, violence, and rapacity; this exotic rule has been seen perhaps at its worst in the valley of the Congo, at its best in the recent government of India, and in Egypt;..... religious missions have been active, but on the whole the benefits conferred have been rather material than moral,"..... "but it is perhaps too soon to cast the balance and to set the advantages against the evils of European rule. It is enough to note the fact that in the world-wide struggle for life, wealth and power, the Europeans have for the moment proved their indisputable dominance; three quarters of the globe have come under their sway; and the independence of the remainder is held by a precarious tenure[1]."

The peace which Europe has enjoyed since 1871 is called an armed peace. The opinion is ventured that the tremendous military equipment and the "non-moral, sordid" world of finance are the powers that are making for peace. And is it not strange that this peace period is marked by a loss in the efficacy of the appeal of religion[2 3 4]? There is indeed much warfare but it is extra-European to the greatest extent.

As the account of those military campaigns is of only minor value now, it is best to take a glimpse at the close of this encyclopedic modern history mainly because much attention is given to this very problem of war and religion.

It is frankly stated that "There is no historical ground for the assumption sometimes made by recent publicists that Christian doctrine, or to speak more exactly, the teaching of any Church that has ever enjoyed considerable authority, condemns war in itself more than any other of the evils incident to a sinful world." In fact, under certain conditions, warfare was regarded as meritorious. But this is now a twice-told tale. Not religion, but the "Law of Nations" is placed in the foreground as the hope of the world for permanent peace. And the best that can be said for the "Law of Nations" is that it is "founded upon justice, equity, convenience, and the reason of the thing, and confirmed by long usage." It is said that the last half century has witnessed the beginning of "serious and concerted endeavor to make the avoidance of war easier and to mitigate its evils when it occurs. The rate of progress is not such as to content the enthusiasts for peace, but it appears to be an increasing rate[5]."

Of course it is only right to emphasize the fact that these estimates and forecasts were printed in a book that appeared a year or two before the war began. The unsatisfying feeling they leave is intensified by reading the books which the leaders of world-thought, the men of vision of today have written during the course of the war itself.

Hobhouse, the distinguished English thinker had afforded some hesitating optimism in his "Morals in Evolution." But this has largely been supplanted by his recent "Questions of War and Peace." (London 1916.) After much fanciful speculation on ethical theories, he considers hard facts. He finds that the future of England and all states once opposed to the German ideal are now set upon German lines. ". . . . war must remain the keynote of its life. This is, I suppose, a conceivable forecast of the political future." But this means re-barbarization. This must be avoided, but no aid may be expected from humanitarian ethics or the peaceful tendencies of commerce. He puts his trust, strange to say, in the importance of the national entity, and draws this peculiar, fine distinction: "The ideal of the future must be not cosmopolitanism but internationalism." But this internationalism is still in the distance. For there is no trust to be placed in Germany. For the present and the future, the existing alliance should be turned into a permanent federation, and only then "through a federation of Allies towards the ultimate ideal of a united Europe[6]."

Much more hopeless than this picture of Hobhouse of the days to be, is given by Georg Brandes in his "The World at War." He regards the rivalry between England and Germany as the cause of the war. He is very bitter against religion. And the press of all countries has stimulated national hatred to such a degree "that one can scarcely see how cooperation among the nations will be possible within the next dozen years." "The clergy in all countries have appeared as the most passionate nationalists[7]." He ridicules the notion that this is the last war[8] [9].

His conviction that from the seeds of this war must develop other wars brings him to his most despairing thought. He fears that Europe will fall into such an exhausted condition that it will become a most easy prey for Japan[10]. While he is sure that the future holds this gloomy prospect, it is not his belief that humanity will never rid itself of war. But Cherbulliez's calculation that from 1500 B. C. until 1860 A. D., about eight thousand peace treaties had been signed, with the supposition that each one meant permanent peace but lasted on an average, only two years, makes Brandes positive that the peace methods used hitherto will not bring the nations nearer their goal[11].

He gives in a nutshell the history of war and religion, similar to that given by Spencer, as noted in chapter one. At the same time he blames religion for the wars of the past. But facts will not bear him out in this. Religion has been but the able second to the plans and plots of the ruling groups. At all events, he finds that national madness has now superseded religion as the cause of war. His closing thoughts are that "Europe is committing hari-kari for the benefit of Japan;" that the longer this war lasts the shorter the peace will be[12] [13] [14]; and he anticipates a wild, raving revolution after the war, made by women and cripples, as "there will scarcely be enough men left." This revolution "will level to the ground

the few remnants of a higher intellectual civilization which the war may have spared[15] [16]."

Romain Rolland also inveighs against religion. He says that "The great trick is to extract from any given idea its precise contrary—war from the Sermon on the Mount." But somewhat paradoxically he writes elsewhere: "There is not one amongst the leaders of thought in each country who does not proclaim with conviction that the cause of his people is the cause of God, the cause of liberty and of human progress. And I, too, proclaim it[17]."

The name of Sir Oliver Lodge commands world-wide attention. One eagerly anticipates reading his book: "The War and After," published shortly after the war broke out. But it proves as disappointing as the war book of the well-known French scholar, Le Bon, on the "Psychology of the Great War."

Lodge's book is uniquely orthodox Christian, and, of course, does not neglect spiritualism. The Germans are savages[18] while England and its allies are the champions of Christendom. If the Germans conquer, death is to be preferred to their domination[19]. He thinks that "Much of the world is not yet completely beyond the tooth and claw period of animal existence[20]." But he cannot insist enough upon stating that "The cause of the Nation is now the cause of Christ[21]." His forcasts are so hazy and his theory of progress so platitudinous that one may hurry on to Le Bon[22] [23].

Le Bon also gives himself over to bitter diatribes against the enemy. But most surprising is the space he yields to the exaltation of patriotism. He defines it as "the heritage from the dead, one of those supreme forces which are created by long ancestral accumulations, and whose strength is revealed at critical moments[24]."

He appears to incline to the view that there will always be war, for war is the founder of civilizations but peace destroys them. At the same time he fears that war will end only in the ruin of the belligerents. He revolts at the thought of a future of savage strife "broken only by stern intervals of gloomy barrack life." He pins his faith on science and on will power. "Conquer or die, but never yield!" "Neither Nature, nor man, nor fate itself, can withstand a strong and steadfast will[25]."

In a word, Le Bon's work represents a strange combination of the haziness of Lodge and the gloominess of Brandes. A group of leading American thinkers contemplates a future of war but in the buoyant spirit of a people that wants to measure its untried strength.

Hart, Seligman and Giddings contributed to a volume entitled: "Problems of Readjustment After the War," published in 1915. Hart recognizes that "war has been the enemy of republics in all ages." If the United States desires to maintain democracy, it must be capable of keeping out hostile armies. "It is a crime which ought to be punishable by confinement in a state's prison, for the American people to rely upon untrained volunteers for future wars[26]." Seligman, of course, puts an economic interpretation upon the whole matter. Capitalism decrees at once more wars and an ultimate peace[27]. Giddings confesses uncertainty as to whether war or peace in the long run plays the larger part in social selection[28]. The last word in the book is given to G. G. Wilson, who finds

no satisfactory criterion "for measuring what is called civilization unless it be, as some claim, the military power[29]."

Of course, this list could be prolonged almost indefinitely; for not only are these eminent men themselves continually re-editing and revising their opinions as the phases of the struggle vary from time to time, but other individuals are looming large on the horizon whose speculations are very worth while, more especially for a treatise on the future of war and religion and on a theory of progress. But when all is said and done, the whole resolves itself into a feeble beating of wings after a wearisome flight; for the riddle of the future remains a riddle; and the criteria of progress are utterly conditioned by the environmental factors surrounding the proponents. To glance again at Durkheim would be beside the mark. To rehearse Kellogg's interesting forecasts in his "Beyond War," might be construed as unfair in the light of his activities in the present war[30]. Neither need one delay for Jevons' oft-iterated phrase that evolution does not mean progress; nor for Spencer's faith in "the industrial type which is higher because in that state of permanent peace to which civilization is tending, it subserves individual welfare better than the militant type[31]." And with Thomas, one need not lament now that the struggle for existence has been mitigated[32]. In the light of these chilling words of cold science, even Tolstoy's rosy religious faith that "for the man who lives according to his law there is no death and suffering" turns grey and dark as the fleeting glory of a rich sunset yields to the cold, pale starlight. In fact, a multiplication of opinions is but a process of being pulled hither and yon, with science calmly anticipating war and the progress it brings, and religion feverishly talking of peace, when the final war, Armageddon, will have been fought in the cause of right and peace, and have been won. So with a moment or two devoted to Thomson and Russell, a halt will be called on this peering into the future and theorizing on progress.

Thomson reviews the Darwinian theory of "struggle for existence" and "natural selection" with an eye on the concept: "mutual aid." He is not sure but that in modern times the "issue of the conflict often depends very largely on length of purse and up-to-dateness of equipment, and only to a slight extent on the organic qualities of the race or people."

And the outcome of his speculations leaves one quite at sea as regards war; as for religion, it surely has already been noted that Leuba's conclusions can find abundant verification among the several authorities here cited, excepting Lodge alone. Such vague terms as ethical outlook, moral values, right and justice may be included in the mental processes of these thoroughly-trained minds wrestling with the problems of life, but religion or God as usually and formally regarded finds no room in their present interests; and as for the future, if the concept progress connotes anything at all, its most perfect synonym for the future as it is for the present, in their opinion, is the word science. If the world of thought is orbital in its movement, then a good illustration of it is seen in the relations between war and religion. For there was war before there was religion; and when religion arose, it was and has been greatly monopolized by war; and now that science has shaken itself almost completely free of religion, its giant strength is harnessed to war and a future is probable, as far as science is concerned, of warfare once again without

religion. But the definition of religion used in these pages precludes the apparent possibility of the disappearance of religion; for even the ultra-materialistic interpretation of the universe, called the mechanistic, is necessarily an attitude to mystery; and it is as much religious as the first stumbling thoughts of remotest man, whether aroused teratistically, or by the life and death of his leader; or any other way. But this is anticipating the general conclusions. So to Thomson's summary.

"We admit that wars have been necessary and righteous—especially necessary—and that they may be so still, but this opinion does not affect the fact that prolonged war in which a nation takes part is bound to impoverish the breed, since the character of the breed always depends on the men who are left. How else can we understand what has happened so often, that an older civilization is overthrown by another less evolved? The only thing a nation dies of is lack of men; and is there not disquieting evidence of the increase of incapables? It is said that we cannot relax one spine of our national belligerence, since we must, at all costs, uphold our national supremacy, having all these teeming millions to feed. But is this not, in part at least, a vicious circle?" But he feels that social improvement would solve many difficulties. As for courage, daring and chivalry, the constructive work of explorers and scientists ought to keep alive these qualities, until now so dependent upon war. Yet, while proclaiming his disbelief in the biological value of war, he will not yield to anyone in his appreciation of the soldier's qualities. The general impression then of this pre-war study of Darwinism is not dissimilar to the residuum of the "mutual aid" idea. Kropotkin did not refuse to recognize the struggle element in life; he simply did not want it to be considered the whole of life. Yet the very idea of "mutual aid" has implicit in it the idea of struggle; for aid is unnecessary unless there is struggle. Further, if the commonalty were capable of the zeal and zest of the explorer in travel and science, there might be point to the plan of turning the "excitement" impluse into constructive rather than destructive channels. And at that, it remains to be shown that these men of science and exploration find such complete satisfaction in their constructivė pursuits, that when wars break out, they refuse to turn from their vocations for the sake of the "minor" interests of destruction. This study limits itself to the relations between war and religion. But in the course of its preparation, more than one bit of evidence was uncovered showing that war was the master not only of religion but of many other forms of human thought and action.

But at length to Russell. While this clear, vigorous and frank thinker concerns himself directly with the problem of this present war, as is abundantly evident in the titles he chose for the notable books he has written in the last two years: "Justice in War-Time" and "Why Men Fight," one does not rise from the reading of his works with any greater certainty of human progress and an idealistic future than all the foregoing writers afford. It is stimulating to gather his thoughts; it is encouraging to breathe in from every page his spirit of candor, of love for the truth and bravery in expressing it as it appears to him. But when boiled down to real essentials, there is not so much to choose between him and Brandes who summed up his whole message in his forbidding title:

"The World at War" surpassed in its melancholy spirit by Zangwill's: "The War for the World."

Russell's "Justice in War-Time" may represent his first reactions to the conflict for it appeared in 1916. It is tinged with Tolstoyan ideals of non-resistance but based on practical rather than on religious grounds. While the book is alive with spirituality, religion is generally ignored. It is the downfall of science that wounds him to the quick. "The degradation of science from its high function in ameliorating the lot of man is one of the most painful aspects of this war. Knowledge with elevation of mind is the chief instrument of human progress; knowledgew ithout elevation of mind easily becomes devilish, and increases the wounds which man inflicts on man."

But he cannot believe that war is under all circumstances a crime. He divides wars into four classes, of which one, "Wars of Prestige," is never justified. At the same time he pleads for experimenting with the idea of non-resistance. Not unlike Thomson, he would replace the pride of military glory with a nobler pride. Nevertheless he thinks the majority of mankind is right in rejecting Quaker or Tolstoyan doctrines. In a somewhat despairing spirit, he agrees that the blood lust is instinctive. His thinking, therefore, becomes quite tenuous when he would solve the problem thus: "But war will only end after a great labor has been performed in altering men's moral ideals, directing them to the good of all mankind, and not only of the separate nations into which men happen to have been born." With the historian Meyer, and with English professors, he sees the end of the era of attempts at international friendship; the next century will be marked with "unconquerable opposition and embittered hate between England and Germany." It means nothing less than the decline of modern civilization. Therefore Russell cries out: "Yet still our newspapers, parsons, and professors prate of the ennobling influence of war[34]."

The note which he strikes in his later book: "Why Men Fight," only intensifies the bitterness, the hopelessness and mirage-like hopefulness and faith that were found in the preceding work. He sees that "war is one of the most permanent institutions of all free communities." Of William James' "Moral Equivalent of War," he sadly says: "But his solution is not adequate; perhaps no adequate solution is possible." It is to be feared that his own treatment of the problem must have this same judgment passed upon it.

In a very vague way, he turns more to the consolations of religion in this volume. Life to be fully human must serve an end impersonal and above mankind, "such as God, truth or beauty." Even if this eternal world is only of our imagining, it is the sole source of strength and peace. He speaks of it in terms of Spinoza as "the intellectual love of God. To those who have once known it, it is the key of wisdom.

"Those who are to begin the regeneration of the world must face loneliness, opposition, poverty, obloquy. They must be able to live by truth and love, with a rational unconquerable hope; they must be honest and wise, fearless, and guided by a consistent purpose."

With all this uncertainty and indefiniteness characterizing the leading intellectual lights of this generation; with all of them admitting that war

under certain circumstances is justifiable; with practically no attention given to religion other than pitiless scoffing at it for being such a fervent handmaiden of war and such a consistent professor, all the while, of peace; with the incipient conviction that Europe is making a shambles of its heritage to be trod underfoot by some alien folk; with full recognition of the fighting impulse or instinct, yet most hazy suggestions of substitutes, other than war, to absorb this blood-lust energy; one is not surprised if the generations turn from the men of knowledge, with their technical language, to the men of life with their office-vocabulary interpretation of war as the struggle for existence, and with their churchly benediction of God's blessing on the cause which the rulers of the land declare to be righteous. If such be the people's guides and saints, then there is no distinction accruing to the thousand and one popular prophets loudly talking of the next war. It is as inevitable as everyone said this one was, after it happened; and the same seers of the populace said before it happened. If, therefore, war is a criterion of progress then there will be progress. And if war needs religion in the future, there will be religion in the future to support war as it has done so unfailingly in the past. At all events, the entire range of history proves that there has been and is nothing so universal among men as warring; and among the leaders of men, there are many more who believe that this battling is right and necessary than believe that an evolution wrought in peace would have brought man as far if not further than the war-process has accomplished.

Life then as lived up to the present gives full warrant for the assertion that war is a good thing. Humanity has evolved with a constant accompaniment of war; and if it is believed that the present is markedly progressive over the past, and the past over the remote past, then to war belongs the credit, for it has been and is the most distinctive, the most continuous, the most thought-inciting and invention-making factor known to man. It is a heritage from pre-humans, the so-called animals and less complex creatures in general. Among all of these the war struggle is an admitted agent making for the swiftest course to ever greater complexity of organism and functioning, with all apologies to the "mutual aid" school of thought. As for man, Russell again most tersely puts it in saying: "But the citizens whom every nation honors most are those who have killed the greatest number of foreigners[36]." Such being the criterion of progress, there is and always has been abundant proof that the world is progressing; and if the opinion of all men, from the meanest-functioning mind, up through all gradations of intellect, to the scholars who sit on the watch towers of universal evolution, are all a unit in looking for future wars, if this uniform opinion means anything, it makes sure that the future will be marked by warfare and hence by progress.

And what of religion? At first blush the case looks very poor. But the present concern is not what religion teaches but what it does. This whole survey of the past gave but little space to the three or four individual religious teachers who taught quietism and peace. Men lived and worked and fought in the spirit of their religion and that is the religion that has counted. Either horn of the dilemma, that religion appears to be in, may be readily cut away, leaving religion free for a war or peace evolution. If

war is primary and religion secondary as this account has abundantly shown it to be, then there is more of the specious in the widespread argument of those who contend that religion has never been tried. It has never been first nor ever been put first. It has been secondary and nothing else; and as such did what it was compelled to do. Now it was shown from history that warfare is the right, the good and the progressive thing for this earth. Therefore, when religion blessed warfare it was doing nothing but the right thing; for its aim is to further the right and the good; and the leaders in war declared that their cause was a righteous cause and that they were deserving of God's blessing. Men, therefore, are unjust in ridiculing religion for coming to the support of war. As far as the inconsistency of yearning for peace and believing in the ultimate triumph of peace is concerned, there again the religious leaders only show a seconding of the war leaders; for the latter almost invariably declare that the war they are waging is to be the last war, and is fought only to usher in the reign of eternal right and peace. It is the government that is paradoxical, or science that does not protest enough, in declaring that war is the sine qua non of progress; that peace is not the desideratum, for it leads to flabbiness of fiber and decay; but, as phrased by many thinkers of all nations—war is the great tonic; and in keeping with the program outlined by Wells in his "Social Forces in England and America" the whole scheme of a nation's educational system should be mapped with an eye single to the highest development of inventiveness and of training for war. If the leaders of the state are hesitant in voicing loudly this dogma, why should religion, whose office is to support the state, vociferously sermonize to that end, until the climax comes; and then all, unabashed, will assert the righteousness of a righteous war. Religion has but played its historic role when it has ably seconded the efforts of war, throughout all times, to make men progress.

History affords ample testimony that war is right. It remains for the sciences of psychology and biology to state definitely, if it can be so stated, that warfare is a necessary part of life, that man can no more keep from this propensity than he can from learning to speak, to live in groups, to form states and empires, to prosecute the scientific disciplines, or to take an attitude to mystery. If these sciences, or any other that may be concerned, affirm categorically that man cannot help himself, he must fight and kill his fellows, so that from the conflict there may arise an attitude to mystery that shall be supreme for the time being, then religion is again exculpated; for if a thing is absolutely necessary, if the human composition has in its make-up what may be called a "unit character," that must be found in all normal human beings, that demands the satisfaction of the blood-lust in warfare, then whatever else may be said of the scorn heaped upon the head of the pacifists, the accusation that they are not normal is thoroughly justified; and religion has fulfilled its divinest function in heeding the call of the God of Battles who implanted in human beings this prepotent entity that necessitates warfare.

It is then that Sociology must unhesitatingly take up its burden and cast the die for a theory of social evolution that looks above and beyond nations to a system that is all-conquering; a theory that, by warfare or its analogue in the remote future, will create a society that will keep the

rage of battle at a fever heat; that will permit no sickly sentimentalizing over blood spilt and treasure lost, nor look askance at men of today or of the past who worshipped the God of Battles.

The record of human and pre-human history amply justifies such a doctrine of progress and such a desirable future for war and religion. It is the verdict of the biologist and the psychologist, added to that of the historian, which will permit the sociologist to hint more directly at the future of war and religion, as well as to understand more thoroughly the past as it has been thus far uncovered.

The most painstaking efforts in the realm of history make sure the fact that there has been and is an essential connection between war and religion, in which war is the primary factor; and up to the vibrating present moment this connection has been thoroughgoing and bids fair to continue so to be.

Bibliography on "War and Religion"

(Note—This list of books represents merely the authorities consulted chiefly for this study. It need hardly be repeated that there is a vast library treating of war and religion in a popular or partisan spirit. As for scientific works, more especially sociological literature, not a few of the books mentioned here contain full bibliographies. "The Source Book for Social Origins," by W. I. Thomas, is, of course, the indispensable hand-book for the student of Social Sciences.)

On "Remote Ancestors"

Czaplicka, M. A.—Aboriginal Siberia (Preface by R. R. Marett). Oxford 1914.
Brinton, D. G.—Religions of Primitive Peoples. New York 1899.
Codrington, R. H.—The Melanesians. Oxford 1891.
Durkheim, E.—The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life. London
Haddon, A. C.—Reports of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to Torres Straits (Vol. V). Cambridge 1904
Jevons, F. B.—An Introduction to the History of Religion. London 1896. (9th Ed. 1914)
Joyce, T. A.—South American Archæology. New York 1912.
Keane, A. H.—Ethnology. Cambridge 1901. (1st Ed. 1895).
Leonard, Major A. G.—The Lower Niger and Its Tribes (Preface by A. C. Haddon). London 1906.
Marett, R. R.—The Threshold of Religion. London 1909.
Morgan, L. H.—League of the Iriquois (New Ed. by H. M. Lloyd). New York 1904.
Mooney, J.—The Ghost Dance Religion. Washington 1896.
Osborn, H. F.—Men of the Old Stone Age. New York 1916.
Peet, T. E.—The Stone and Bronze Ages in Italy and Sicily. Oxford 1909.
Pitt-Rivers, A. Lane, Fox.—The Evolution of Culture. Oxford 1906. (Preface by H. Balfour.)
Quiggin, A. H.—Primeval Man. London 1912.
Rivers, W. H. R.—The Todas. London 1906.
Roscoe, J.—The Northern Bantu. Cambridge 1915.
Roth, H. L.—Aborigines of Tasmania. Halifax 1899 (Preface by E. B. Tylor.)
Spencer, B.—Native Tribes of the Northern Territory of Australia. London 1914.
Spencer, B., and Gillen, F. J.—The Native Tribes of Central Australia. London 1899.
Spencer, B., and Gillen, F. J.—The Northern Tribes of Central Australia. London 1904.
Thomas, W. I.—Source Book for Social Origins. Chicago 1909.

Books on "Immediate Ancestors"

A—Historical

Acton, Lord.—(planned) The Cambridge Modern History Vol. 1 New York 1902.
Vol. 2 New York 1904.
Vol. 3 New York 1905.
Vol. 12 New York 1910.
Breasted, J. H.—Ancient Times. Boston 1916.
Bury, J. B.—(planned) The Cambridge Medieval History Vol. 1 New York 1911.
Vol. 2 New York 1913.
Davis, H. W. C.—Medieval Europe. New York 1911.
Duruy, V.—A Condensed History of the Middle Ages. New York 1900.

B—Religions

Aston, W. G.—Shinto. New York 1905.
Braithwaite, W. G.—The Beginnings of Quakerism. London 1912.
Breasted, J. H.—Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt. New York 1912.
Coomaraswamy, A.—Buddha and the Gospel of Buddhism. New York 1916.
Cumont, F.—Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans. New York 1912.
DeGroot, J. J. M.—Religion in China. New York 1912.
DeGroot, J. J. M.—Sectarianism and Religious Persecution in China. Amsterdam 1903.
Dhalla, M. N.—Zoroastrian Theology. London 1914.
von Domaszewski, A.—Die Religion des Römisches Heeres. Trier 1895.
Farnell, L. R.—The Higher Aspect of the Greek Religion. New York 1912.
Fowler, W. W.—The Religious Experience of the Roman People. London 1911.
Fowler, W. W.—Roman Ideas of Deity. London 1914.

Harrison, J. E.—Themis. Cambridge 1912.
Jastrow, M., Jr.—The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria. Boston 1898.
Jones, R. M.—The Quakers in the American Colonies. London 1911.
Moore, G. F.—History of Religions. New York 1914.
Plato's Republic—Translated by J. L. Davies and D. J. Vaughan. London (1st Ed. 1852, reprint 1910).
Renel, C.—Les Enseignes. Lyon 1903.
Smith, W. R.—The Religion of the Semites. London 1901.
Spencer, H.—Principles of Sociology. New York 1901.
Sweet, W. W.—The Methodist Episcopal Church and the Civil War. Cincinnati 1912.

Contemporaries on War and Religion

(A Condensed List)

Archer, W.—Gems (?) of German Thought. New York 1917.
Ballard, Frank—Christianity After the War. London 1916.
Bang, J. P.—Hurrah and Hallelujah. New York 1917.
Barry, F. R.—Religion and the War. London 1915.
Baudrillart, A.—German War and Catholicism. Paris 1915.
Bell, G. K. A.—The War and the Kingdom of God. London 1915.
Benedict XV—His Holiness Pope Benedict XV on the Great War. London 1916.
von Bernhardi, F.—Germany and the Next War. London 1912.
Brandes, Georg.—The World at War. New York 1917.
Brown, Charles—The War and the Faith. London 1915.
Carpenter, J. E.—Ethical and Religious Problems of the War. London 1916.
Catholics of the British Empire. London 1916.
Chadwick, W. E.—German Christianity and the Great War. London 1914.
Cunningham, W.—Christianity and Politics. Boston 1915.
Denney, J.—War and the Fear of God. London 1916.
Foakes-Jackson, F. J.—The Faith and the War. London 1915.
Goodwin, W. A. R.—The Church Enchained. New York 1916.
Gulick, S. L.—The Fight for Peace. New York 1915.
Hart, A. B., and others—Problems of Readjustment After the War. New York 1915.
Hobhouse, L. T.—Morals in Evolution. (Rev. Ed.) New York 1916.
Hobhouse, L. T.—Questions of War and Peace. London 1916.
Kellogg, V. L.—Beyond War. New York 1912.
Le Bon, G.—The Psychology of the Great War. New York 1916.
Leuba, J. H.—The Belief in God and Immortality. Boston 1916.
Loeb, J.—Mechanistic Conception of Life. Chicago 1912.
Lodge, O.—The War and After. London 1915.
Loisy, A.—The War and Religion. Oxford 1915 (Introd. by A. Galton).
Murray, G.—Faith, War and Policy. New York 1917.
Osborne, C. E.—Religion in Europe and the World Crisis. New York 1916.
Oxford Pamphlets 1914-1915 on Religion and War.
Rolland, R.—Above the Battle. London 1916.
Russell, B.—Why Men Fight. New York 1917.
Russell, B.—Justice in War-Time. Chicago 1916.
Russell, B.—Principles of Social Reconstruction. London 1917.
Shotwell, J. T.—Religious Revolution of Today. Boston 1913.
Thomson, J. A.—Darwinism and Human Life. New York 1911.
Tolstoy, Leo N.—My Confession, etc. Boston 1904.
von Wilamowitz-Mollendorf, U.—Deutsche Reden in Schwerer Zeit. Vol. 2. Berlin 1915.

References in the Text of "War and Religion"

Introduction

[1]B Russell, "Why Men Fight," p. 79
[2]R. R. Marett, "Threshold of Religion," p. 3
[3]J. T. Shotwell, "Religious Revolution of Today," p. 9
[4]Shotwell ibid, p. 111
[5] " " p. 156
[6] " " p. 162
[7]J. H. Leuba, "Psych. Origin of Religion," p. 41
[8]C. H. Toy, "Introd. Hist. of Religion," p. 160
[9]Marett ibid., p. 35

References, Chapter I

[1]Marett ibid., p. 155
[2] " " p. X
[3]Russell ibid., p. 116
[4]Durkheim, "Elem. Forms Rel. Life," p. 10
[5] " " " " " p. 16
[6] " " " " " p. 47
[7] " " " " " p. 187
[8] " " " " " pp. 188–189
[9] " " " " " p. 190
[10] " " " " " p. 204
[11] " " " " " p. 206
[12] " " " " " p. 206
[13] " " " " " p. 214
[14] " " " " " pp. 218–219
[15] " " " " " p. 221
[16] " " " " " p. 232
[17] " " " " " pp. 233–234
[18] " " " " " p. 234
[19] " " " " " p. 272
[20] " " " " " p. 419
[21]Leuba, "Belief in God and Immortality," p. 40
[22] " " " " " " p. 281
[23] " " " " " " pp. 321–322
[24] " " " " " " pp. 325–326
[25] " " " " " " pp. 324–325
[26]Jevons, "Introd. to Hist. of Religion," p. 19
[27] " " " " " " p. 19
[28] " " " " " " p. 87
[29] " " " " " " pp. 99–101
[30] " " " " " " p. 101
[31] " " " " " " p. 382
[32] " " " " " " p. 410
[33]Keane, "Ethnology," pp. 216–217
[34]H. Spencer, "Princ. of Sociology," p. 422
[35] " " " " " p. 556
[36] " " " " " p. 559
[37] " " " " " p. 560
[38] " " " " " p. 12
[39] " " " " " p. 25
[40]Spencer ibid., p. 520
[41] " " p. 525
[42] " " p. 557
[43]Pitt-Rivers, "Evolution of Culture," p. 55
[44] " " " " p. 56
[45] " " " " p. 58

[46]Jevons ibid., pp. 96–97
[47] " " p. 242
[48]W. I. Thomas, "Source Book for Social Origins," pp. 155–156
[49]V. L. Kellogg, "Beyond War," pp. 120–123
[50] " " " " p. 125
[51] " " " " pp. 140–141
[52]Russell ibid., pp. 6–7
[53] " " pp. 12–13
[54] " " p. 113
[55] " " p. 79

Chapter II, Section A

[1]Thomas ibid., p. 12
[2] " " p. 167
[3] " " p. 13
[4]H. F. Osborn, "Men of Old Stone Age," p. 83
[5] " " " " " " " p. 60
[6] " " " " " " " pp. 107–149
[7] " " " " " " " p. 162
[8] " " " " " " " p. 168
[9] " " " " " " " p. 24
[10] " " " " " " " p. 226
[11] " " " " " " " p. 232
[12] " " " " " " " p. 235
[13] " " " " " " " p. 236
[14] " " " " " " " p. 215
[15] " " " " " " " p. 248
[16] " " " " " " " pp. 249–258
[17] " " " " " " " pp. 260–261
[18] " " " " " " " p. 272
[19] " " " " " " " p. 292
[20] " " " " " " " p. 316
[21] " " " " " " " p. 351
[22] " " " " " " " p. 358
[23] " " " " " " " pp. 388–390
[24] " " " " " " " p. 450
[25] " " " " " " " pp. 456 and 502
[26]Pitt-Rivers ibid., pp. 89–90
[27]Keane ibid., pp. 120–122
[28]Kellogg ibid., pp. 27, 33, 47, 129 et passim
[29]J. A. Thomson, "Darwinism and Human Life," pp. 213–214
[30]Spencer ibid., p. 547

Section B, Part 1

[31]Osborn ibid., p. 214
[32]D. G. Brinton, "Religions of Primitive Peoples," p. 209
[33]Kellogg ibid., p. 49
[34]Leuba ibid., p. 5
[35]Osborn ibid., p. 24
[36]A. H. Quiggin, "Primeval Man," p. 120
[37] " " " " p. 94
[38]Leuba ibid., pp. 18–19
[39] " " p. 33
[40]Jevons ibid., p. 86
[41]Keane ibid., p. 137
[42]Brinton ibid., pp. 34–36
[43] " " pp. 70–71
[44] " " pp. 206–207
[45]Kellogg ibid., p. 69
[46] " " p. 90
[47]Osborn ibid., pp. 221–226

[46]Osborn ibid., p. 270
[49] " " p. 305
[50] " " pp. 501–502
[51]T. E. Peet, "The Stone and Bronze Ages, Etc.," p. 55
[52] " " " " " " " " p. 113
[53]Peet ibid., pp. 118–122
[54] " " p. 174
[55] " " p. 211
[56] " " p. 225
[57] " " pp. 228–237
[58] " " pp. 280–283
[59] " " pp. 289–394
[60] " " pp. 432–445
[61] " " p. 492ff
[62]Osborn ibid., p. 358
[63] " " p. 392

Chapter II, Section B, Part 2

[64]E. B. Tylor, "Limits of Savage Religion," p. 283ff
[65]E. B. Tylor, "Tasmanians," p. 149ff
[66]H. L. Roth, "Aborigines of Tasmania," p. V and VI
[67] " " " " " pp. 53–56
[68] " " " " " p. 61
[69] " " " " " pp. 72–73
[70] " " " " " p. 115
[71] " " " " " pp. 116–118
[72] " " " " " pp. 137–138
[73] " " " " " p. 145
[74] " " " " " p. 160
[75] " " " " " pp. 227–228
[76]Spencer & Gillen, "Northern Tribes of Central Australia, Etc.," pp. 15–18
[77]Spencer & Gillen, "Native of Central Australia," p. 32
[78]Spencer & Gillen, "Northern of Central Australia," pp. 31–32
[79]B. Spencer, "Native of Northern Australia," p. 11
[80]Spencer & Gillen, "Northern of Central Australia," p. 33ff
[81] " " " " " " " p. 145
[82] " " " " " " " p. 176
[83] " " " " " " " p. 227
[84] " " " " " " " p. 238
[85] " " " " " " " p. 248
[86] " " " " " " " p. 277–278
[87] " " " " " " " p. 328
[88] " " " " " " " p. 330
[89] " " " " " " " p. 387
[90] " " " " " " " pp. 392 & 490
[91] " " " " " " " p. 501
[92] " " " " " " " p. 511
[93] " " " " " " " pp. 544–545
[94] " " " " " " " p. 556ff
[95] " " " " " " " p. 568
[96] " " " " " " " pp. 596–597
[97] " " " " " " " p. 608
[98] " " " " " " " pp. 634–635
[99]Spencer & Gillen, "Native Tribes of Central Australia," pp. 133–135
[100] " " " " " " " " p. 461
[101] " " " " " " " " pp. 476–477
[102] " " " " " " " " pp. 478–481
[103] " " " " " " " " p. 497
[104] " " " " " " " " p. 530
[105] " " " " " " " " p. 537
[106] " " " " " " " " pp. 602–604
[107]L. H. Morgan, "League of Iroquois," pp. 13–14

[108]L. H. Morgan, "League of Iroquois," pp. 178–179
[109] " " " " " pp. 257–260
[110]J. O. Dorsey, "A Study of Siouan Cults," pp. 390–493
[111]J. W. Fewkes, "The Prehistoric Culture of Tusayan," pp. 161–165
[112]J. Mooney, "Ghost Dance Religion," pp. 711–715
[113] " " " " pp. 764, 777 and 796
[114] " " " " p. 783
[115] " " " " p. 824
[116]A. C. Haddon, "Torres Straits, etc," p. 1
[117] " " " " pp. 3–4
[118] " " " " pp. 273
[119] " " " " p. 277
[120] " " " " p. 302
[121]Hose and McDougall, "Men and Animals in Sarawak," pp. 174–181
[122] " " " " " " " " p. 212
[123]R. H. Codrington, "Melanesians," pp. 118–120
[124] " " p. 120
[125] " " pp. 124–127
[126] " " pp. 129, 132
[127] " " p. 135
[128]A. G. Leonard, "Lower Niger Tribes," p. X
[129] " " " " p. XII
[130] " " " " pp. XII–XIII
[131] " " " " p. 23
[132] " " " " pp. 70–71
[133] " " " " p. 119
[134] " " " " pp. 166–167
[135] " " " " p. 177
[136] " " " " pp. 178–185
[137] " " " " pp. 397–398
[138]J. Roscoe, "Bantu," pp. 14–15
[139] " " pp. 81–82
[140] " " p. 96
[141] " " p. 132
[142] " " p. 161
[143] " " pp. 184–185
[144] " " pp. 243–244
[145] " " p. 245
[146]W. H. R. Rivers, "Todas," pp. 182–186
[147] " " pp. 187–207
[148] " " p. 295
[149] " " pp. 337, 361 and 586
[150] " " pp. 518–521
[151] " " pp. 554–555
[152] " " p. 586
[153] " " p. 716
[154]M. A. Czaplicka, "Aboriginal Siberia," p. VIII
[155] " " " pp. 24–27
[156] " " " pp. 37–38
[157] " " " pp. 68–69
[158] " " " pp. 129–145
[159] " " " pp. 168, 203
[160] " " " p. 243
[161] " " " pp. 256–259
[162] " " " pp. 273–275
[163] " " " pp. 289–290
[164]T. A. Joyce, "South American Archaeology," pp. 17–18
[165] " " " " pp. 23–29
[166] " " " " pp. 66–67
[167] " " " " p. 86
[168] " " " " pp. 91–95
[169] " " " " pp. 100–113
[170] " " " " pp. 144–147

References for Chapter III, Section A

[1]J. H. Breasted, "Ancient Times," pp. 32–34
[2] " " " pp. 44–45
[3] " " " p. 85
[4] " " " pp. 120–121
[5] " " " pp. 157–163
[6] " " " pp. 172–174
[7] " " " p. 178
[8] " " " pp. 207–214
[9] " " " p. 244
[10] " " " p. 320
[11] " " " p. 714

References for Chapter III, Section B, Part 1

[1]J. H. Breasted, "Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt," pp. 5–6
[2] " " " " " " " " " " pp. 8–9
[3] " " " " " " " " " " pp. 14–24
[4]G. F. Moore, "History of Religions," pp. 149–169
[5] " " " " " pp. 176–177
[6]Breasted, ibid., pp. 49–51
[7] " " pp. 84–91
[8] " " p. 281
[9] " " p. 309
[10] " " pp. 313–315
[11] " " pp. 349–369
[12] Moore, ibid., pp. 188–189
[13] " " p. VI

References for Chapter III, Section B, Part 2

[1]M. Jastrow, Jr., "Religion of Bab. and Assyr.," p. 49
[2] " " " " " " " pp. 53–57
[3] " " " " " " " pp. 66–72
[4] " " " " " " " pp. 83–85
[5] " " " " " " " pp. 91–117
[6] " " " " " " " pp. 118–120
[7]Moore, ibid., pp. 209–211
[8]Jastrow, ibid., p. 192
[9] " " pp. 193–205
[10] " " pp. 212–222
[11] " " p. 296
[12] " " pp. 312–314
[13] " " p. 317
[14] " " pp. 329–348
[15] " " p. 374
[16] " " pp. 376–382
[17] " " pp. 533–534
[18] " " p. 567
[19] " " pp. 694–695
[20]Moore, ibid., pp. 221–222

References for Chapter III, Section B, Part 3

[1]Moore, ibid., p. 329
[2] " " pp. 325–327
[3] " " p. 249
[4] " " p. 327
[5] " " pp. 343–344
[6] " " pp. 359–360
[7]M. N. Dhalla, "Zoroastrian Theology," pp. 11–12
[8] " " " " pp. 13–16
[9] " " " " pp. 47–52

[10]Moore, ibid,. pp. 364–365
[11] " " p. 371
[12] " " p. 378
[13]Dhalla, ibid., pp. 82–83
[14] " " pp. 96–135
[15] " " p. 143–146
[16] " " p. 187
[17] " " pp. 277–278
[18]Moore, ibid., pp. 403–405

References for Chapter III, Section B, Part 4

[1]Moore, ibid., p. 301
[2]A. Coomaraswamy, "Buddha and Gospel of Buddhism," p. 182 note
[3] " " " " " " " p. VI
[4] " " " " " " " p. 91
[5] " " " " " " " p. 110
[6] " " " " " " " p. 115
[7] " " " " " " " pp. 115–123
[8] " " " " " " " p. 214
[9] " " " " " " " p. 126
[10] " " " " " " " p. 138
[11]Coomaraswamy, ibid., p. 139
[12] " " " pp. 158–159
[13] " " pp. 182–184
[14] " " p. 222
[15] " " p. 281
[16]Moore, ibid., p. 325
[17] " " p. 297
[18] " " p. 299

References for Chapter III, Section B, Part 5

[1]Moore, ibid., p. 94
[2] " " pp. 3–4
[3] " " pp. 4–6
[4] " " pp. 7–17
[5] " " pp. 20–22
[6] " " pp. 25–36
[7] " " pp. 37–42
[8] " " pp. 48–56
[9]J. J. M. DeGroot, "Religion in China," pp. 2–4
[10] " " " " " " p. 16ff.
[11] " " " " " pp. 206, 208, 211, 221
[12] " " " " " pp. 43, 44, 286, 318
[13]J. J. M. DeGroot, "Sectarianism and Rel. Persec. in China," pp. 2–3
[14] " " " " " " " " " " p. 90
[15] " " " " " " " " " " pp. 149
[16] " " " " " " " " " " p. 162
[17] " " " " " " " " " " pp. 273–274
[18] " " " " " " " " " " p. 559ff.
[19] " " " " " " " " " " p. 565

References for Chapter III, Section B, Part 6

[1]Moore, ibid., p. 94
[2] " " p. 93
[3] " " p. 95
[4]W. G. Aston, "Shinto," p. 6
[5] " " " p. 44
[6] " " " p. 56
[7] " " " pp. 65–66
[8] " " " pp. 70–71
[9] " " " p. 135

[10]W. G. Aston, "Shinto," pp. 178–179
[11] " " " pp. 218–219
[12] " " " pp. 232–234
[13] " " " p. 360
[14]Moore, ibid., p. 111
[15] " " pp. 118–122
[16] " " pp. 123–124
[17] " " pp. 137–138
[18]Aston, ibid., p. 360
[19] " " p. 362
[20] " " pp. 372–373
[21] " " pp. 374–376

References for Chapter III, Section B, Part 7

[1]L. R. Farnell, "Higher Aspects of Greek Religion," p. 82
[2]J. E. Harrison, "Themis," p. 1
[3] " " pp. 15–16
[4]Moore, ibid., pp. 432–434
[5]Harrison, ibid., p. 28
[6] " " p. 46
[7] " " pp. 87–90
[8]Farnell, ibid., p. 1
[9] " " pp. 64–65
[10] " " p. 69
[11] " " pp. 81–82
[12] " " pp. 96–97
[13] " " pp. 128–131
[14]Moore, ibid., pp. 413–417
[15] " " pp. 419–420
[16] " " p. 431
[17] " " pp. 420–424
[18] " " p. 428
[19] " " p. 438
[20] " " pp. 477–478
[21] " " pp. 463–469
[22] " " p. 489
[23] " " pp. 494–495
[24]Plato's Republic (Edition in Bibl.), pp. 60–74
[25] " " " " " pp. 176–179
[26] " " " " " p. 184
[27] " " " " " p. 187
[28] " " " " " p. 270

References for Chapter III, Section B, Part 8

[1]C. Renel, "Les Enseignes," p. 6
[2]A. von Domaszewski, "Die Religion des Römisches Heeres," p. 2
[3] " " " " " " p. 8
[4] " " " " " " p. 19
[5]W. W. Fowler, "Rel. Exper. of Roman People," p. 25
[6]Moore, ibid., p. 543
[7] " " pp. 545–546
[8] " " p. 548
[9] " " pp. 552–557
[10] " " p. 558
[11] " " pp. 572–573
[12] " " p. 575
[13] " " pp. 592–595
[14] " " p. 596
[15]F. Cumont, "Astrology & Relig. Among the Greeks & Romans," pp. 182, 38, 99, 180, 181
[16]Fowler, ibid., p. 71
[17] " " p. 87, note ten
[18] " " p. 93

[19]Fowler, ibid., p. 96
[20] " " pp. 129–134
[21] " " pp. 204–206
[22] " " p. 208
[23] " " pp. 249–251
[24] " " p. 309
[25] " " p. 329
[26] " " p. 336
[27] " " pp. 462–465
[28]W. W. Fowler, "Roman Ideas of Deity," p. 84

References for Chapter III, Section B, Part 9

[1]W. R. Smith, "Relig. of Semites," pp. 29–32
[2] " " " " " pp. 35, 36 and 37
[3] " " " " " pp. 53–54
[4] " " " " " pp. 64–74
[5] " " " " " pp. 258, 263, 264, 266 and 359
[6]Jewish Encyc., vol. 12, pp. 463–466
[7] " " vol. 9, pp. 160–162
[8] " " vol. 6, pp. 1–15
[9] " " vol. 9, pp. 565–567
[10]A. Cronbach, "Socialism," Chapt. 10, D. D. Thesis, Hebrew Union Col., Cincinnati, 1913

References for Chapter III, Section C

[1] "Cambridge Medieval History," vol. 1, p. 1
[2] " " " pp. 4–5
[3] " " " pp. 8–10
[4] " " " pp. 12–23
[5] " " " pp. 150–151
[6] " " " pp. 170–173
[7] " " " p. 174
[8] " " " pp. 288–291
[9] " " " pp. 303–308
[10] " " " p. 312
[11] " " " p. 315
[12] " " " pp. 323–359
[13] " " " p. 590
[14] " " " vol. 2, ibid., pp. 1–43
[15] " " " pp. 111–116
[16] " " " pp. 304–308
[17] " " " pp. 313–317
[18] " " " pp. 318–321
[19] " " " pp. 323–328
[20] " " " pp. 329–354
[21] " " " p. 390
[22] " " " pp. 463–550
[23] " " " pp. 578–658
[24] " " " p. 689
[25] "Cambridge Modern History," vol. I, pp. 2–3
[26] " " " p. 12
[27] " " " pp. 56–66
[28] " " " p. 68
[29] " " " p. 97
[30] " " " p. 98
[31] " " " p. 143
[32] " " " pp. 144–189
[33] " " " pp. 200–218
[34] " " " pp. 225–360
[35] " " " pp. 460–483, 569–571, 579
[36] " " " p. 653
[37] " " " pp. 655–667

[38] "Camb. Modern History," pp. 668–672
[39] Vol. 2, ibid., p. 104
[40] " " pp. 165–209
[41] " " pp. 223–224
[42] " " p. 227
[43] " " p. 228
[44] " " p. 689
[45] " " p. 691
[46] Vol. 3, ibid., p. V
[47] " " p. 7
[48] " " pp. 19–20
[49] " " pp. 36–37
[50] " " pp. 65–68
[51] " " pp. 74, 76, 77, 80, 84
[52] " " pp. 104–105
[53] " " p. 126
[54] " " pp. 264, 271, 285, 292, 345–347, 351–353, 506–509
[55] " " pp. 362–363
[56] " " pp. 464–466, 520
[57] " " pp. 740–743
[58] " " pp. 745–748, 768–769
[59] W. W. Sweet, "Methodist Episcopal Church and the Civil War," p. 8
[60] " " " " " " " " " p. 9
[61] " " " " " " " " " p. 14
[62] " " " " " " " " " pp. 20–21
[63] " " " " " " " " " pp. 25 and 34
[64] " " " " " " " " " pp. 42, 58–60
[65] " " " " " " " " " pp. 77–79, 87–90
[66] " " " " " " " " " p. 103
[67] " " " " " " " " " p. 112
[68] " " " " " " " " " pp. 128–129
[69] " " " " " " " " " p. 167
[70] Jewish Encyclopedia, vol. 12, pp. 363–364. Also Jewish Periodical Press as "American Israelite," "Occident," etc.

References for Chapter IV

[1] Russell, "Why Men Fight," p. 221
[2] Jevons, ibid., p. 415
[3] W. E. Wilson, "Christ and War," pp. IX–XII
[4] " " " " " pp. 15–18
[5] " " " " " p. 29
[6] A. G. Hogg, "Christianity and Force," p. 3
[7] " " " " " pp. 3, 4, 16
[8] F. J. Foakes-Jackson, "The Faith and the War," pp. 192, 195
[9] J. Denney, "War and the Fear of God," p. 81
[10] F. Ballard, "Christianity After the War," p. 8
[11] F. R. Barry, "Religion and the War," p. 7
[12] W. E. Wilson, ibid., pp. X–XI
[13] " " " pp. 69–76
[14] A. Baudrillart, "German War and Catholicism," pp. 13–46
[15] " " " " " p. 61
[16] F. B. Proctor, "The National Crisis, etc., Churches Fail," pp. 13, 22
[17] C. Brown, "The War and the Faith," p. 77
[18] W. Cunningham, "Christianity and Politics," pp. 34, 70, 183, 263
[19] " " " " p. VI
[20] " " " " pp. 249, 252, 254–255, 263
[21] Philadelphia Morning "Public Ledger," 12–25–17
[22] W. E. Chadwick, "German Christianity and the Great War," p. 14
[23] J. E. Carpenter, "Ethical and Religious Problems of the War," pp. 5, 7, 13, VI
[24] Gilbert Murray, "Faith, War and Policy," pp. X, XI
[25] " " " " " " pp. 7–8
[26] " " " " " " p. 9

[27]Carpenter, ibid., p. 182
[28]Oxford Pamphlets, 1914–1915, W. B. Selbie, "The War and Theology," pp. 10–12, 15
[29]A. Loisy, "The War and Religion," p. XVII
[30] " " " " " p. 62
[31] " " " " " p. XXVII
[32] " " " " " p. 21
[33] " " " " " pp. 64–65
[34]J. P. Bang, "Hurrah and Hallelujah," p. 16
[35] " " " " " pp. 35–40
[36] " " " " " pp. 42ff.
[37] " " " " " pp. 54, 59, 62, 72, 79, 88
[38] " " " " " p. 90
[39] " " " " " p. 133
[40] " " " " " pp. 192, 216, 217
[41]W. Archer, "Gems (?) of German Thought," pp. 4, 5, 6, 7
[42] " " " " " " pp. 14–16, 21, 27
[43] " " " " " " p. 52
[44] " " " " " " p. 59
[45] " " " " " " p. 94
[46] " " " " " " p. 143
[47] " " " " " " pp. 153–154
[48]U. v.Wilamowitz-Mollendorf, "Deutsche Reden, etc.," vol. 2, p. 87
[49]"New York Times," 4–2–17
[50] " " 4–16–17
[51] " " 12–26–17
[52]Murray, ibid., pp. 253–254
[53]Foakes-Jackson, ibid., pp. 97–98
[54] " " title page
[55] " " pp. X, XI
[56]"The Church and International Relations," published by Fed. Counc. of Churches of Christ in Am., vol. 3, pp. 197, 203
[57]"The Churches of Christ in Time of War," published by preceding, passim
[58] " " " " " " " " " " " " p. VII
[59]S. L. Gulick, "The Fight for Peace," p.10
[60]"New York Times," 12–25–17
[61]Philadelphia Morning "Public Ledger," 2–25–17; Philadelphia "Evening Bulletin," 3–31–17
[62]Loisy, ibid., p. XVIII
[63]Cunningham, ibid., pp. 102–103, 260
[64]W. C. Braithwaite, "Beginnings of Quakerism," pp. 12, 23, 28, 30, 53, 228, 280, 298, 313, 315
[65]W. C. Braithwaite, "Beginnings of Quakerism," pp. 519–520
[66]R. M. Jones, "The Quakers in the American Colonies," p. 556
[67]Philadelphia "Public Ledger," 9–5–17; 6–23–17, Philadelphia "Evening Bulletin," 8–16–17
[68] " " " 6–18–17
[69] " " " 5–30–17
[70] " " " 10–21–17
[71]Tolstoy, "My Confession, etc.," Book I, p. 447; cf. also pp. 82–83, 85, 227, 235 et passim
[72]Ibid, Book II, pp. 8, 9, 15
[73] " " p. 393
[74] " " pp. 414, 427
[75]Foakes-Jackson, ibid., p. 204
[76]Ballard, ibid., p. 7
[77]Russell, ibid., p. 222
[78]Philadelphia "Evening Bulletin," 12–22–17
[79]F. von Bernhardi, "Germany and the Next War," p. 10
[80] " " " " " " " pp. 22,30
[81] " " " " " " " pp. 42, 47
[82] " " " " " " " pp. 71–72
[83] " " " " " " " pp. 247, 252–253, 258, 261, 293, 300
[84]H. G. Wells, "Social Forces in England and America," p. 171 et passim, cf. also his "Mr. Britling, etc.," "God the Invisible King" and "The Soul of a Bishop."

References for Chapter V

[1]"Cambridge Modern History," vol. 12, p. 5
[2] " " " " p. 7
[3] " " " " pp. 14, 15, 64
[4] " " " " p. 700
[5] " " " " pp. 705–706, 715, 716
[6]Hobhouse, "Questions of War and Peace," pp. 188–189, 191–192, 212–214, 223–224
[7]G. Brandes, "World at War," pp. 41, 43, 52, 75, 77, 78
[8]Brandes, ibid., p. 128
[9] " " pp. 139–140, 152, 160
[10] " " p. 163
[11] " " pp. 173–177
[12] " " pp. 178–182
[13] " " pp. 219–227
[14] " " pp. 209, 237–238
[15] " " pp. 234–235
[16] " " pp. 247–248
[17]R. Rolland, "Above the Battle," pp. 110 and 43
[18]O. Lodge, "The War and After," pp. 5, 7, 8, 11, 12
[19] " " " " " pp. 24, 26, 50
[20] " " " " " p. 115
[21] " " " " " pp. 119–122, 125, 140
[22] " " " " " pp. 213–214, 225
[23] " " " " " pp. 230–231
[24]Le Bon, "Psych. of the Great War," pp. 306–307
[25] " " " " " " pp. 309–311, 422–423, 460–461, 470–471
[26]A. B. Hart, etc., "Problems of Readjustment, etc.," pp. 17, 29, 35
[27] " " " " " " " pp. 61, 65, 67, 69
[28] " " " " " " " pp. 73 74, 79
[29] " " " " " " " p. 130
[30]"New York Times" Book Review, 11–25–17
[31]H. Spencer, ibid, p. 600
[32]Thomas, ibid., pp. 172–173
[33]Thomson, ibid., pp. 91, 93, 214, 226 and 226 note
[34]B. Russell, "Justice in War Time," pp. 17–18, 20, 28, 35–36, 40, 57, 59, 67, 68, 94, 111, 120, 136, 202
[35]Russell, "Why Men Fight," pp. 79, 100, 227, 268, 269, 270 et passim
[36] " " " " p. 55